

The Classical Review

NEW SERIES VOLUME I NO. 2

(VOLUME LXV OF THE CONTINUOUS SERIES)

June 1951

PINDAR, ISTHMIANS 6. 4

IN *I.* 6. 3-5 the primary manuscripts (BD) have: ἐν Νεμέᾳ μὲν πρῶτον, ὦ Ζεῦ, τὴν ἄωτον δεξάμενοι στεφάνων, νῦν αὖτ' ἐν Ἰσθμοῦ δεσπότη (δέσποτα D) Νηρείδεσσι τε πενήκοντα. Despite the paraphrase of Σ^{BD} ad loc., which might be thought to point (though rather shakily) to a reading ἐν Ἰσθμῷ, Pindar's use of δεσπότης and δέσποινα (*P.* 4. 11, *N.* 1. 13, *Frr.* 29 Tur., 130 Tur. 11, 14) compels us to take Ἰσθμοῦ δεσπότη together. The editor's problem is to get rid of ἐν; hence αὖτις Byz., αὖτε Usener (an invention on the analogy of ἐπειτεν), αὖτε Hermann (for hiatus before Ἰσθμός cf. *I.* 1. 9, 32), αὖ τὴν Bergk (with δέσποτα).

It happens that these lines are quoted by Σ^{BD} in the hypothesis of *I.* 5 (Drachmann, iii, p. 240, l. 22): there, while Σ^B has αὖτ' ἐν, as in the text of *I.* 6, Σ^D has αὖτε. Bury took this seriously, as evidence that the author of Σ^{BD} had αὖτε in his text; Schroeder and Mommsen may have thought this, but their critical notes on *I.* 6 do not make it clear. Other editors, whether they adopt αὖτε (e.g. Bowra, Turyn) or merely mention it, attribute it to Hermann and say nothing of Σ^D.

There is, I believe, some additional evidence that Bury was right. According to Σ's metrical analysis of *I.* 6, the words νῦν . . . δεσπότη constitute the seventh colon of the strophe. This colon is analysed thus: (Dr. iii, p. 250, l. 6) τὸ ζ' διμετρον ἱαμβικὸν ἀκατάληκτον μετὰ τοῦ ἐ' εὐρηται. The words μετὰ τοῦ ἐ' εὐρηται are puzzling ('sensu cassa', Dr.). ἐ', according to the usage of the Pindar Σ, should refer to the fifth colon. εὐρηται cannot then have its usual sense 'is found, sc. in other passages' (cf. Σ *recc.*, Abel i, p. 62, l. 12, Eust. on Hom. *Il.* i. 8, etc.). It could mean 'is found, sc. in some texts' (cf. εὐρομεν, Σ^A Hom., Dindorf, i, p. 54, l. 2, etc.), but 'the seventh colon is found in some texts with the fifth' is a strange textual comment to find in a metrical analysis. 'The analysis of the seventh colon is found in some texts with that of the fifth' (so Boeckh, Abel) makes sense, but it is hard to see why Σ should find so obvious a mistake worth mentioning. Nor is the easy emendation εἶρηται (cf. Dr. iii, p. 1, l. 13) helpful.

The metrical analyses in the Pindar Σ, ostensibly applicable to the whole poem, sometimes refer without warning to the first triad only. So in the analysis of the first colon of the epode of *I.* 6: τὸ α' ἐκ Σαπφικοῦ τοῦ ἐνδεκασυλλάβου Πινδαρικόν. ἢ τοι: ἢ τοι *codd.*) κοινή ἐστι; in which the last words can only refer to l. 17, the first colon of the first epode, ὕμνε τ' ὦ χρυσάρματι Αἰακίδα. Again, in *I.* 8, ἡ νον μακρά (Dr. iii, p. 269, l. 13) refers to πόνον in l. 8 of the first strophe. On this analogy, we may suspect that μετὰ τοῦ ἐ' εὐρηται conceals a reference to l. 4: read μετὰ τοῦ ἐ' εὐρηται (<...>), meaning

'(the seventh colon is an iambic dimeter acatalectic) *with the ε*', i.e. 'the ε of *αἰτε* being unelided'. It is not easy to supplement the lacuna. We expect a metrical, not a textual, comment; but the natural comment, that hiatus occurs elsewhere before *Ἰσθμός*, would be startling in a Greek *Σ* and can hardly be entertained (I owe this warning to Dr. R. Pfeiffer). Probably something more banal must be supplemented, e.g. *εὔρηται* <δὲ πολλὰ ἐκ πλήρους γεγραμμένα>. Be that as it may, *μετὰ τοῦ ε* makes sense. I suppose therefore that the author of the metrical analysis of *I. 6* had *αἰτε* in his text and thought it worth while to warn the reader against elision. Similarly, the author of the hypothesis of *I. 5* read *αἰτε*, which *Σ^D* preserved there, while *Σ^B* altered it to *αἰτ'* ἐν to conform with his already corrupted text of *I. 6*. (On *Σ^B*'s treatment of quotations, see Turyn, *Philologus*, 1935, p. 117.)

Balliol College, Oxford

K. J. DOVER

PLATO, *PHAEDO* 67 c 5

κάθαρσις δὲ εἶναι ἄρα οὐ τοῦτο συμβαίνει, ὅπερ πάλαι ἐν τῷ λόγῳ λέγεται, τὸ χωρίζειν ὅτι μάλιστα ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος τὴν ψυχὴν . . . ;

THE aim of this note is to combat the interpretation of the phrase *ὅπερ πάλαι ἐν τῷ λόγῳ λέγεται* given by Burnet in his edition of the *Phaedo*. It is all the more necessary to raise a voice of protest because four of the other editors—Archer-Hind, Wagner, Geddes, Williamson—make no comment whatsoever, and one, Wohlrab, takes the same line as Burnet.

Let us begin by considering the meaning and context of the passage. 'Socrates' is drawing the conclusion that intellectual *κάθαρσις* is the same as something which has been spoken of 'in time past' (*πάλαι*), namely, the *χωρισμός* of the soul from the body. Now this *χωρισμός* was repeatedly commended at an earlier stage of the discussion, e.g. at

64 c: οὐκοῦν ὁλως δοκεῖ σοι, ἔφη, ἡ τοῦ τοιούτου (sc. φιλοσόφου) πραγματεία οὐ περὶ τὸ σῶμα εἶναι, ἀλλὰ καθ' ὅσον δύναται ἀφεστάναι αὐτοῦ, πρὸς δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν τετράφθαι ;

65 c: λογίζεται (sc. ἡ ψυχὴ) δὲ γέ που τότε κάλλιστα ὅταν . . . αὕτη καθ' αὐτὴν γίγνηται ἐὼσα χαίρειν τὸ σῶμα . . .

66 a: ἀπαλλαγείς (sc. ὁ φιλόσοφος) ὅτι μάλιστα ὀφθαλμῶν τε καὶ ὠτῶν καὶ ὡς ἔπος εἰπὲν σὺμπαντος τοῦ σώματος . . .

Can we, then, accept Burnet's assertion that 'this (i.e. τὸ χωρίζειν, κτλ.) has not been said in the course of the present argument'? I think not, especially as, on his own analysis (p. 27), the 'present argument' runs from 63 e to 69 e.

The rest of Burnet's note seems to be equally questionable. He apparently translates *ὅπερ πάλαι ἐν τῷ λόγῳ λέγεται* 'as is said by those of old in the Word', remarks that this 'seems to be the regular way of referring to the Orphic *ἱερός λόγος*', and compares 63 c 6, 70 c 5, and 69 c 5. It is significant that, as far as I can ascertain, the only translation which agrees with Burnet's rendering is that of the Hon. Patrick Duncan, a writer who, in his preface, expresses his deep obligation to Burnet's edition. Moreover, a parallel as good as those adduced by Burnet is to be found in 79 c, where, in a reference to our present context, Plato uses a similar turn of phrase: οὐκοῦν καὶ τότε πάλαι ἐλέγομεν; This must mean: 'Were we not maintaining this point some time ago?'. Similarly I think that *ὅπερ πάλαι . . . λέγεται* means: 'what has been the subject

of our argument for some time past'. (Cf. E. M. Cope, *Plato's Phaedo literally translated*, p. 20: 'And may we not consider purification to be, what has been long indicated in the course of our discussion, the most complete attainable separation of the soul from the body . . .?') As he nears the end of his *apologia* 'Socrates' is keen to emphasize the logical structure of his argument (cf. 66 e $\omega\varsigma\ \delta\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma\ \sigma\eta\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota$).

The strongest point in Burnet's note is the comparison with 63 c, where the phrase $\omega\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\ \gamma\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\iota\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ is used to qualify the assertion that in the next world the good fare better than the wicked. This can hardly be a reference to the discussion of suicide in 62 a-c. It must therefore be taken as an allusion to tradition. But it does not follow that there is a similar allusion in 67 c. Apart from any question of context, the two phrases are far from identical. In the first phrase $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\iota$ is emphasized by $\kappa\alpha\iota$, an emphasis which is perhaps more natural if it means 'of old' rather than 'just now'. In the second phrase $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\iota$ is qualified by $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omega$, and must be taken closely with it. And if it is reasonable to render $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omega$ by 'in the argument', then $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\iota$ will naturally mean 'just now'.

Again, the two phrases differ in content as well as in form. There were plenty of $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\iota$ in earlier Greek literature, and, we may presume, in Greek popular belief, on the subject of rewards and punishments in the next world (e.g. Homer, *Il.* iii. 279, xix. 259, *Od.* xi. 576-600; *Hom. Hymn to Demeter* 480-2; Aeschylus, *Suppliants*, 230-1; Pindar, *Ol.* ii. 62 ff.; for popular beliefs, cf. Plato, *Rep.* 330 d). But where is there a reference to the technique of the *vita contemplativa* as summarized in this passage of the *Phaedo*?

If, then, it be allowed that Burnet's translation and interpretation are at fault, and that his parallels are inconclusive, it follows that there is no ground for his conjecture that Plato's thought is indebted to an Orphic prototype. And further, his assertion that the $\pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ of 70 c (doctrine of reincarnation) is 'Orphic' should not be supported by a cross-reference to the present passage.

Trinity College, Dublin

J. V. LUCE

THE RHETRA OF LYCURGUS: $\phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}$ and $\acute{\omega}\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}$

In the words $\phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\xi\alpha\tau\alpha$ there seems to be a pun. In some sense the $\phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}$ were to be 'tribalized' and given their due tribal functions; they were thus also to be 'preserved'. On this phrase was coined a new rhyming word $\acute{\omega}\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\iota$: in some sense the $\acute{\omega}\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}$ were to be 'made $\acute{\omega}\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}$ ' in some significant way; and this was how the $\phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}$ were to be preserved, and the $\gamma\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ was to become $\tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\alpha\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$.

The problem, and the remedy, may have been as follows:

1. In any confederation of tribal groups, it is desirable that the $\phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}$ should remain in some agreed relation to each other, of size and influence. Through accidents of war or disease, these relations might be disturbed: and so long as the $\gamma\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ consisted simply of the heads of all constituent families or clans or districts within the tribe, any $\phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}$ might predominate undesirably.

2. If, as seems to be agreed, the $\acute{\omega}\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}$ were some kind of subdivision of the $\phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}$ —gentile groups, or parishes ($\tau\acute{o}\pi\omicron\iota\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\omicron\mu\epsilon\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$)—it was an easy remedy to distribute or redistribute them among the $\phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}$ as formal subdivisions to

limit the numbers of the *γερονσία* to thirty, as the *Rhetra* proposes—presumably the round number nearest to the actual number of traditional *ὠβαί*; and to make these thirty *γέροντες* the actual heads of thirty statutory *ὠβαί*. This would equalize the representation of the three *φυλαί* in the *γερονσία*, and also prevent any *ὠβή* from acquiring more than its share of representation within its *φυλή*.

3. There is perhaps emerging now a further pun. As *πεμπάζειν* is to 'count by fives', *ὠβάζειν* may mean to 'count by *ὠβαί*'; which is what this suggestion does, in constituting the new *γερονσία* of thirty members.

4. The two kings presumably met in the *γερονσία* as the *γέροντες* (*ex officio*) of their respective *ὠβαί*: hence the *γερονσία* now consisted of *τριάκοντα σὺν ἀρχαγέταις*.

Oxford

JOHN L. MYRES

TWO PASSAGES OF LUCAN

(1)

et uos, crinigeros bellis arcere Caycos
oppositi, petitis Romam Rhenique feroces
deseritis ripas et apertum gentibus orbem. i. 463-5

The natural interpretation of *bellis arcere Caycos oppositi* is 'posted to restrain the Chauci from war',¹ and its rightness seems confirmed by the following words: by the garrison's departure to join Caesar's army the empire is laid open to the fierce tribes of the Rhine.² This interpretation is rejected by Housman, who accepts (as does Francken) Bentley's conjecture *Belgis* (regarded by Professor Eduard Fraenkel as conclusively established by Housman)³ on the grounds that 'the Romans had no wish whatever to restrain the Chauci either from war (compare Tac. *Germ.* 33) or by means of war: they wished to restrain them, by means of military posts, from attacking the north-east of Gaul',⁴ and 'to show that the Romans had no wish to restrain the Chauci from war, but only from war on Roman subjects, I adduced Tac. *Germ.* 33, where the Romans are seen exulting in the wars of Germans upon other Germans and praying to heaven for their continuance'.⁵ (It is in fact the historian who prays to heaven: the passage is subjective in character.) Such an argument seems to me something of a quibble; it is discussed further below. Nor does the passage which Housman (after Bentley) quotes from Claudian provide any evidence that *Belgis* is what Lucan wrote, viz. *Stil.* i. 225 f. 'trans fluuium non indignante Chauco / pascat Belga pecus' (one manuscript *bella*).⁶ Certainly, the express reference (426) to the Belgians' share in the general joy at the Romans' departure gives little support to the conjecture.

Professor Getty⁷ preserves *bellis*, but maintains (Introd., p. xlix) that the interpretation *a bellis gerendis* 'is negatived, not so much by what Tac. says of other German tribes in ch. 33 of his *Germ.*, as by his precise statement two

¹ Cf. Liv. xxv. 9. 6 'ad arcendum populationibus hostem', etc.

² Cf. viii. 424 f. 'Arctoum Dacis Rhenique cateruis / imperii nudare latus'.

³ *Gnomon*, ii, 1926, p. 506.

⁴ *C.R.* xiv, 1900, p. 468.

⁵ *C.R.* xv, 1901, p. 129. In his edition much to the same effect: 'neque bellorum

ope Romani, sed castrorum praesidiurumque, Caycos arcebant, neque a bellis gerendis prohibebant (uide Tac. *Germ.* 33), sed a bello Gallis finitimis inferendo, id est Belgis'.

⁶ Any more than does Spart. *Did.* i. 7 (see below), where Housman notes the error *bellicam* for *Belgicam*.

⁷ Edition of Book I, Cambridge, 1940.

chapters later about the Chauci'. In ch. 35 Tac. depicts the Chauci in glowing terms as people who 'sine cupiditate, sine impotentia, quieti secretique nulla prouocant bella, nullis raptibus aut latrociniiis populantur', etc. This testimonial leads Professor Getty to regard *bellis* as instrumental and to translate 'to keep them at a distance by force of arms'. That *bellis*, if regarded as instrumental, can mean nothing but 'by means of war' is not admitted by him. Housman, he tells us, 'shows his complete misunderstanding of the meaning by his remark in rejecting the instrumental ablative: "neque bellorum ope Romani, sed castrorum praesidiorumque, Caycos arcebant". *Bella* are precisely *castra praesidiaque*, or *arma* generally, by a metonymy which is of the most frequent occurrence in Latin poetry'. Heitland¹ also is impressed by Tac.'s eulogy, but (being, like Housman, innocent of metonymy) thinks that *bellis* may 'mean "by wars"', that is, by campaigns carried on, when necessary, beyond the Rhine'. As Housman, however, points out, frontier garrisons are not posted for that purpose. We may ask, moreover, if the Chauci were such exemplary folk, what need was there either of Heitland's 'wars' or of Professor Getty's 'force of arms'? A Sunday school mission would have more than met the case. And why should Lucan immediately afterwards refer to the *Rheni feroces ripas* and *apertum gentibus orbem*? Heitland has an answer: the Chauci, he suggests, are 'a rather ill-chosen *pars pro toto*'.²

The truth is that the Romans had good reason to fear aggressive attacks on the part of the Chauci, as a consideration of the somewhat meagre facts at our disposal shows. It is clear, indeed, that they were far from being the saintly characters portrayed by Tac. in the *Germania*, and evidence to the contrary is to be found in his other works.³ Their history is briefly this.⁴ They became subject to Rome in A.D. 5, but under Tiberius, it seems, again recovered their independence. Since the time of Claudius they became definitely hostile and it is evident that a campaign was needed against them in 41, as we read in Suet. *Claud.* 24. 3 that the Emperor 'Gabinio Secundo Cauchis gente Germanica superatis cognomen Cauchius usurpare concessit'; the same victory is testified to by Dio Cass. lx. 8. 7. Their warlike adventures were, however, soon resumed, as Tac. himself tells us, viz. *Ann.* xi. 18 f. 'per idem tempus [A.D. 47] Chauci . . . inferiorem Germaniam incursauere duce Gannasco, qui . . . leuibis nauigiis praedabundus Gallorum maxime oram uastabat, non ignarus dites et inbelles esse.' They were defeated by Corbulo, as a result of whose vigorous measures

¹ C.R. xv, 1901, p. 79.

² To which Housman rejoined (C.R. xv, 1901, p. 130) 'they are very well chosen, and they are not a *pars pro toto*'. Professor Getty also (Intro., p. xliii) toys with the notion of *pars pro toto* (though he knows better than to use so childish a term). He is worried because the Chauci did not dwell near the Rhine and thinks 'It is possible to say that *Caycos* = *Germanos* by synecdoche'. But Pliny, erroneously or not, puts the Chauci on the Rhine, viz. *Nat.* iv. 101 'in Rheno autem ipso . . . nobilissima Batauorum insula et Cannenefatium et aliae Frisiorum, Chaucorum, Frisiauonum . . . quae sternuntur inter Helinium ac Fleuum'. We may note too the statement (referred to by Professor

Getty) of Tac. *Germ.* 35 that the tribe stretched southwards as far as the Chatti (whose territory extended from the Rhine). No doubt the activities of the Chauci beyond their own domains led to some confusion as to their habitation. In any case it is idle to press the words *Rheni feroces ripas* too closely; the point is that for Lucan the Chauci lived somewhere beyond the Rhine, but did not always stay beyond it (see below).

³ Cf. J. G. C. Anderson on *Germ.* 35. 1: 'Tac. had obviously little information about the Chauci and confines himself to their general qualities, which he idealizes at the expense of truth'. There is no mention of them in Caesar.

⁴ See Pauly-Wissowa, R.E., s. 'Chauci'.

barbari ferociam infregere. Resentment, however, smouldered, for 'caede eius (sc. *Gannasci*) motae Chaucorum mentes, et Corbulo semina rebellionis praebebat'. In striking contrast with the amiable qualities ascribed to the Chauci in the *Germ.* and proof of their distaste for a quiet and unprofitable life is Tac.'s reference (*Ann.* xiii. 55) to the Ampsivarii, a German tribe who (in A.D. 58) 'pulsī a Chaucis et sedis inopes tutum exilium orabant'. Subsequently, in 69-70, the Chauci joined Civilis in his revolt against the Romans, and together with the Frisians represented *flagrantissima cohortium suarum* (*Hist.* iv. 79). That they retained their interest in north-east Gaul a century later is shown by Spart. *Did.* i. 7 'Belgicam sancte ac diu rexit. ibi Cauchis, Germaniae populis, qui Albim fluvium adcolebant, erumpentibus restitit'.

In view of such precise evidence of the tribe's bellicose disposition, a statement that the garrison was 'posted to restrain the Chauci from war' seems the most natural in the world. By 'war' the reader could only understand war launched against Roman territory, and the following words make the poet's meaning clear beyond doubt. Housman's invocation of *Germ.* 33 is surely but an irrelevancy and can carry little weight as an argument against the propriety of *bellis*. The reasoning of Heidland and Professor Getty, on the other hand, does not stand up to a critical examination of Tac.'s statements in *Germ.* We may therefore dispense with the alteration *Belgis*, which seems in any case to specify too precisely the function of the garrison, and, accepting the unanimous reading of the manuscripts, ascribe to Lucan's words the sense which they naturally bear.

(2)

iam uento uela negarat

Magnus et auxilio remorum infanda petebat
litora; quem contra non longa uecta biremi
appulerat sclerata manus, Magnoque patere
figens regna Phari celsae de puppe carinae
in paruam iubet ire ratem, litusque malignum
incusat bimaremque uadis frangentibus aestum,
qui uetet externas terris adpellere classes. viii. 560-7.

Pompey's vessel approaches the coast of Egypt and is met by a small boat containing the assassins. In 563 the unparalleled sense of the verb *adpellere* ('come alongside' Postgate with misgivings, Duff, 'approach' Haskins, Ponchont;¹ contrast 567 where *adpellere*² has the normal sense of 'put in to shore' = *προσέχειν*) as well as the strange use of the pluperfect tense (where the present would offer no metrical difficulty) led Bentley to conjecture *approperat*, Postgate *adcelerat*. Housman merely records Bentley's objections to the traditional reading.

The passage remains unsatisfactory. It is not very clear how either *approperat* or *adcelerat* developed into *appulerat* nor does there seem to have been any occasion for speed. Now an action which would be particularly appropriate at this point would be a greeting, and a reading that suggested itself to me on considering the passage was *appellat* ('hailed'). This, I find, has in fact already been tentatively proposed by Professor W. B. Anderson.³ That it is what Lucan wrote seems confirmed by a comparison with other accounts of the episode, in

¹ The *Thes. Ling. Lat.* gives no guidance, making no distinction between this passage and numerous routine instances.

² So at least ZMV, Heidland, Postgate,

Housman, Ponchont, *expellere* G, *aduertere* PU, Hosius, 'non male' Housman.

³ In his review of Housman's edition in *C.R.* xli, 1927, p. 32.

particular that of Caesar, who uses the actual word, viz. *B.C.* iii. 104 '(amicis regis) Achillam . . . et L. Septimium . . . ad interficiendum Pompeium miserunt. ab his liberaliter ipse appellatus et quadam notitia Septimi productus . . . nauiculam paruulam conscendit'. Note the emphasis on the greetings proffered to Pompey in the other accounts, which tally remarkably closely with Lucan at this point: Plutarch, *Pomp.* 78. 2 f. ἐν τούτῳ δὲ πελαζούσης τῆς ἀλιάδος φθάσας ὁ Σεπτίμιος ἐξανέστη καὶ Ῥωμαῖστί τὸν Πομπήϊον αὐτοκράτορα προσηγόρευσεν. ὁ δὲ Ἀχλλᾶς ἀσπασάμενος αὐτὸν Ἑλληνιστὶ παρεκάλει μετελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ἀλιάδα· τέναγος γὰρ εἶναι πολὺ, καὶ βάθος οὐκ ἔχειν πλόιμον τριῆρει τὴν θάλατταν ὑπόψαμμον οὖσαν, Dio Cass. xlii. 4. 1 f. Σεπτίμιος καὶ Ἀχλλᾶς . . . ἄλλοι τε μετ' αὐτῶν ὄντες . . . ἐπιβάντες προσέπλευσαν αὐτῷ, καὶ τὰ τε ἄλλα ἐφιλοφρονήσαντο αὐτὸν καὶ ἤξιωσαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς μετεκβῆναι, λέγοντες μήτε τινα (ναῦν) δύνασθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ μεγέθους διὰ τὰ βράχη πρὸς τὴν γῆν προσσχέιν, Appian, *B.C.* ii. 84 σκάφος εὐτελὲς ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐπέμπετο, ὡς τῆς θαλάσσης οὐσης ἀλτεινοῦς καὶ μεγάλας ναοὺς οὐκ εὐχεροῦς, ὑπηρεταί τε τινες τῶν βασιλικῶν ἐνέβαινον ἐς τὸ σκάφος. καὶ Σεμπρώνος¹ . . . δεξιὰν ἔφερε παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως τῷ Πομπήϊῳ καὶ ἐκέλευεν ὡς ἐς φίλον τὸν παῖδα διαπλεῦσαι. Cf. also Vell. ii. 53. 2 'missi itaque ab rege, qui uenientem Cn. Pompeium . . . exciperent ('welcome') hortarenturque, ut ex oneraria in eam nauem, quae obuiam processerat, transcenderet'. It is true that at a later stage, when Pompey is about to enter the enemy craft, Lucan represents Septimius as giving a salutation,² but we miss a reference to the greeting emphasized by the other narrators at the first encounter.

The corruption of *appellat* into *appulerat* may well have been caused by the proximity of *scelerata*: in transcribing *appellat* the copyist's eye travelled forwards to *scelerata* and caused him to write *elerat* (or *ellerat*) for *ellat*, viz. *appellerat* (*appellerat*);³ this, assisted by the nautical atmosphere and the actual use of *adpellere* in 567, would not take long to develop into *appulerat*.

University College of Wales, Aberystwyth

A. HUDSON-WILLIAMS

A TRANSPOSITION IN STATIUS

In his *Achilleid* Statius tells of the artifice of Thetis to prevent her son from engaging in the imminent war against Troy: she disguises him as a girl and contrives his admission among the throng of maidens at the court of Lycomedes. At line 592 (I use the enumeration of the Oxford text) we read

tandem detecti timidae Nereidos astus.

Which is very odd, for the Nereid's stratagem is not exposed until 852 ff. The verse has no connexion with the preceding lines and editors who retain it make it introduce the ensuing description of a bacchanalian festival. But Achilles' enforced participation in no way leads to the detection of the disguise imposed upon him by Thetis. Nor can 592 derive any truth from the incident fifty lines farther on (640 ff.), where Achilles reveals himself to Deidamia: first, the

¹ Apparently an error for Σεπτίμιος.

² Vv. 595 ff. 'transire parantem / Romanus Pharia miles de puppe salutat / Septimius'.

³ A form of dittography (see Havet, *Manuel*, c.g. § 717); cf. cases like Virg. *Aen.*

v. 311 Am[ph]azoniam pharetram (M), Georg. iv. 260 son[us] auditur (M), and Liv. xxi. 29. 5 ex consiliis coeptisque hostis where (under influence of previous word) for hostis most manuscripts have hospitibus, with hospiciis and auspiciis as further refinements.

likely consummation of the romance is adequately suggested by the apt simile of 588-91; secondly, the deceit of the timorous Nereid was the concealment of Achilles from the Greek host, not from any maiden who might distract her son's interest from war, as is evident from 319-22; thirdly, Achilles himself chafes under the restrictions (625-36) which the *timidae commenta parentis* have imposed upon him, and these restrictions are not affected by 640 ff. since he puts up with them for nearly a year longer; lastly, that Deidamia understood the deceit to have been exposed by Ulysses at 867 and not by the conduct of Achilles at 642 is clear from 885 f., where she bewails the *resectos . . . dolos*.

Led, no doubt, by such considerations, H. W. Garrod struck out 592 as an interpolation. Yet it is not easy to imagine why it should have been composed by an interpolator for a position in the poem where its meaning is untrue. If, however, 592 is a genuine verse which has been misplaced, there is an obvious hiatus which it might once have filled.

Elsewhere we are told how Ulysses and Diomedes arrive at Scyros in quest of Achilles. At a banquet given in their honour they meet the noble maidenfolk, amongst whom the son of Peleus can ill conceal his interest in the Greek chieftains. Then follows

- 767 quid nisi praecipitem blando complexa moneret
Deidamia sinu nudataque pectora semper
exsertasque manus umerosque in ueste teneret
770 et prodire toris et poscere uina uetaret
saepius et fronti crinale reponeret aurum.
ut placata fames, etc.

767 quid P, quod QK.

Those who retain the reading of the Puteaneus are forced to place an interrogation mark after *aurum* and understand the ellipse of *euenisset*, thus producing the question 'What would have happened, had not Deidamia . . .?' Well, it is natural to infer that the disguise would have been penetrated, but we expect the poet to tell us, not ask us: the mode of expression (*quid nisi . . .?*) aptly introduces the indignant and unanswerable questions of Ovid, *Tr.* i. 8. 29 ff., but here it merely mars the sequence of the narrative. Nor do we expect the suppression of the climax to which the series of verbs *moneret . . . teneret . . . uetaret . . . reponeret* naturally leads, for the sustained protasis depends for its effect on a culminating apodosis. But these criticisms will not apply if we accept the *quod* of QK and postulate after 771 the omission of a verse the gist of which was 'then the masquerade of Achilles would have been exposed'. This solution of the difficulties was reached centuries ago by the interpolators of the less trustworthy manuscripts which proffer the makeshift verse

- 772 Argolicis ducibus iam tunc patuisset Achilles.

Now while the manuscript tradition of PQQ indicates no spurious verses or lacunae at all, from the foregoing argument it appears that 592 is alien to its present position and must be removed and that after 771 a verse has been lost. Is it not very remarkable that the verse which must be shifted from the one place should repair perfectly the damage at the other? I therefore conjecture that what Statius wrote was

- 767 quod nisi praecipitem blando complexa moneret
Deidamia sinu nudataque pectora semper
exsertasque manus umerosque in ueste teneret

- 770 et prodire toris et poscere vina uetaret
 saepius et fronti crinale reponeret aurum,
 592 tandem detecti timidæ Nereidos astus.
 773 ut placata fames, etc.

'And if Deidamia had not put the impetuous youth on his guard and restrained him from quitting the safety of his seat, the deception contrived by Thetis would at last have been brought to light.' The frequent omission of *sum* is so characteristic of Statius that nobody need demur at the ellipse of *essent* in 592 any more than at the similar ellipse of *esset* in *utinam et mihi fortior ætas* which occurs three lines farther on.

University College, Hull

G. P. GOOLD

TWO NOTES ON JUVENAL

I. ii. 163 ff.

et tamen unus
 Armenius Zalaces cunctis narratur ephebis
 mollior ardenti sese indulsisse tribuno.
 aspice quid faciant commercia: uenerat obses,
 hic fiunt homines. nam si mora longior urbem
 indulsit pueris non umquam derit amator.
 mittentur bræcæ, cultelli, frena, flagellum.
 sic prætextatos referunt Artaxata mores.

HOUSMAN (ad ii. 168): '*indulsit* pro *indulserit* soloecum est; neque enim, ut Silio poetæ epico ex Vergilii imitatione *iusso*, sic Iuuenali saturarum scriptori *indulso* dicere licuit. *præbuerit* ante *pueris* excidisse suspicor, lacunam deinde uel ex 165 uel ex 140 expletam.' Housman rightly diagnosed *indulsit* as a solecism, but his suggested remedy is too drastic; only the tense is at fault. I suggest that the original reading was *indulget*. The more colloquial present, as well as the future or future perfect, tense may stand in a condition of this sort: cf. Juv. iii. 239-40 'si uocat officium, turba cedente uehetur / diues . . .', xiv. 145-7 'quorum si pretio dominus non uincitur ullo, / nocte boues macri lasso-que famelica collo / iumenta ad uiridis huius mittentur aristas . . .'. As for the corruption, the change from *indulget* to *indulsit* was influenced by the tense of *indulsisse* in 165. The same error occurred in 140 of this satire, where Vindobonensis 107 reads *indulsit*, but all the other manuscripts correctly *indulget*.

II. x. 311 ff.

fiet adulter
 publicus et poenas metuet quascumque mariti
 irati debet, nec erit felicior astro
 Martis, ut in laqueos numquam incidat. exigit autem
 interdum ille dolor plus quam lex ulla dolori
 concessit: necat hic ferro, secat ille cruentis
 uerberibus, quosdam moechos et mugilis intrat.

313 exire irati A, irati P alique, exigere irati cet. debet P, debent cet. lex iræ Housman, læsi iræ Vianello, maritis iratis Rigaltius, ira sibi debet Madvig, exigere iratist Munro

The apparatus shows that some flaw mars the beginning of 313; and the fact that the manuscripts are deficient in sense or metre or both has provoked a number of conjectures, no one of which is generally accepted. I suggest that

the passage should read *quascumque mariti / ex ira debet*, an emendation that provides sense and accounts for the several variants. The corruption originated as follows: *ex ira* was glossed with *irati* and then corrupted to *exire*; cf. Lucr. vi. 72 'ut ex ira poenas petere inibat acris': *ex ira* Marullus, *exire* OQ. In A the gloss *irati* was copied into the line: *exire irati*. In P and some other manuscripts *irati* completely displaced the corrupt *exire*; cf. Juv. vi. 159 'observant ubi festa mero pede sabbata reges': *nudo pede* PO. The other *deteriores* preserve a vestige of the original reading; for *exigere* is most likely an emendation of *exire* suggested by *exigit* in 314. *mariti irati* was felt as nom. plur. and *debet* consequently altered to *debent* in all manuscripts save P. The sense of the passage emended is: 'Your son will become a promiscuous gallant and fear whatever punishment he owes as a result of a husband's wrath.' The varieties of husbandly wrath are mentioned in 316-17.

Amherst College

WENDELL CLAUSEN

AN EMENDATION IN ISOCRATES

Aereopagiticus 12: ἀπάσης γὰρ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὑπὸ τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν ὑποπεσοῦσας καὶ μετὰ τὴν Κόνωνος ναυμαχίαν καὶ μετὰ τὴν Τιμοθέου στρατηγίαν, οὐδένα χρόνον τὰς εὐτυχίας κατασχεῖν ἠδυνήθημεν, ἀλλὰ ταχέως διεσκαρφήσάμεθα καὶ διελύσαμεν αὐτάς.

How should we translate *διεσκαρφήσάμεθα*? Norlin has 'dissipated' and Mathieu 'gaspillés', which give good sense. But I shall first try to show that the word cannot be so translated, and shall then suggest what I consider to be the right reading.

L. & S. interpret the word in our passage to mean 'sketch in outline', hence 'slur over'. This view is based on one sentence in the scholiast's long note on Ar. *Frogs* 1497 (al. 1545) (on the text καὶ σκαριφήσμοις λήρων): καὶ σκαριφήσασθαι ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐπισσευρμένους τι ποιεῖν, καὶ μὴ κατὰ τὴν προσήκουσαν ἀκριβείαν.

All other evidence, however, gives to words coming from the same root an exactly opposite meaning—one of accuracy to the point of pedantry. The scholiast on *Clouds* 630 (on σκαλαθυρμάτι ἄττα) has: λεπτὰ καὶ μικρὰ νοήματα, σκαριφήματα. In *Frogs* 1497, L. & S. themselves give 'petty quibbles' for *σκαριφήσμοι λήρων*, and Hesychius has, s.v. σκαρίφος: ξέσις, γραφή, μίμησις ἀκριβῆς τύπου. The scholiast already quoted on *Frogs* 1497 says earlier: σκαριφεύειν γὰρ τὸ τοῦς ζωγράφους ὑποτυπῶσαι πρῶτον τοὺς γραφομένους, i.e. to make the preliminary sketch, accurate in essentials, but not yet filled in with extra detail (cf. Hesychius' μίμησις ἀκριβῆς τύπου). That this is the meaning of *ὑποτυπῶσαι* can be seen most clearly from Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1098^a21: it is entirely misleading to translate it 'to make a rough copy'.

How then do we account for *σκαριφήσασθαι ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐπισσευρμένους τι ποιεῖν* . . . ? Should this represent an independent tradition, we must still treat it with respect. If, however, we turn to Harpocration, we find s.v. *διεσκαρφήσάμεθα*: 'Ἰσοκράτης Ἀρεοπαγίτικῳ. σκαριφήσασθαι ἐστὶ τὸ ἐπισσευρμένους τι ποιεῖν καὶ μὴ κατὰ τὴν προσήκουσαν ἀκριβείαν, and in Suidas we have the same phrase repeated, again with reference to Isocrates, together with another rather far-fetched attempt at interpreting the word in our passage, all headed by *διεσκαρφήσάμεθα ἀντὶ τοῦ διελύσαμεν*. It appears therefore that we have no separate tradition here.

What then does *διεσκαρφήσάμεθα* mean in Isocrates in view of our other evidence? The idea contained in the words coming from the same root, quoted above, would seem to be the representation of something in its barest essentials—a kind of dry, unsatisfactory pedantry. I do not think L. & S.'s 'petty quibbles' for *σκαριφήσμοι λήρων* gives quite the right emphasis. In *Clouds* 630, where *σκαλαθυρμάτι ἄττα* occurs, it is clear from the context that the reference is not so much to 'quibbling', which implies a certain sophistication, but rather to the rudiments of 'Philosophy'.

We could perhaps, therefore, torture the language of our passage into meaning: 'We have lost our fortune through our excessively bleak and unimaginative rule.' But apart from its strangeness and unexpectedness, this metaphor is utterly inappropriate in the context. It is just after the Social War, and Isocrates is directing his argument against *ἀνοία καὶ μετὰ ταύτης ἀκολασία*, and pleading for *σωφροσύνη καὶ πολλὴ μετρίότης*. We do, in fact, need a word which really does mean 'dissipated' or 'gaspillés'.

In *Aereop.* 48, Isocrates, in praise of former

days, says: τοιγαροῦν οὐκ ἐν τοῖς σκιραφείοις διέτριβον. σκιραφείον is a gambling-house (cf. Theopompus bk. 50, quoted by Harpocration) and σκίραφος is given as a dice-box in *Elym. Mag.* 717. 28. I suggest, therefore, that we read διεσκιραφήσάμεθα and translate 'we have gambled away'. We may compare κατακυβεύσας τὰ ὄντα (*Lys.* 14. 27). The εὐτυχία in our passage include the concept of material prosperity, and one of the follies of the Athenians mentioned just before (ch. 9) was πλείω ἢ χίλια τάλαντα μάτην εἰς τοὺς ξένους ἀνηλακότες.

T. L. ZINN

New College, Oxford

THE 'MURDER' OF DRUSUS, SON OF TIBERIUS

THE great superiority of Tacitus over our other ancient sources for the principate of Tiberius is obvious to anybody who has made even the slightest study of the period. It was emphasized by F. B. Marsh (*The Reign of Tiberius*, Oxford, 1931, 272-83) and, whatever may be thought of Tacitus' use of innuendo, I still believe (see *J.R.S.* xxxvi, 1946, 171) that there is no case where, in dealing with the principate of Tiberius, Tacitus is demonstrably wrong in his facts.

Werner Eisenhut in a recent article, 'Der Tod des Tiberius-Sohnes Drusus', *Museum Helveticum*, vii (1950), 123-8, has examined the story that Drusus, son of Tiberius, was poisoned in A.D. 23 by his wife Livia, whom Sejanus had corrupted, and that the truth was made known by Sejanus' discarded wife, Apicata, eight years later, after her husband's death. He claims that the dates of the deaths in A.D. 31 of the various members of the family of Sejanus, known from the *Fasti Ostienses* (*C.I.L.* xiv Suppl. 4533, col. ii. 15 ff.) prove the falsity of the circumstances in which, in A.D. 31, Apicata is said by Cassius Dio (lviii. 11. 5-7) to have given Tiberius an account of the 'crime' of A.D. 23.

That is perfectly true.

What is not true is that, as Eisenhut claims, Tacitus' account of all this must have been substantially the same as Cassius Dio's. We have lost Tacitus' account of the deaths in A.D. 31 of Sejanus, his elder son, his wife Apicata, and of Livia herself. The one piece of evidence that we have (*Annals* v. 9) shows that, while Cassius Dio put the grisly execution of Sejanus' young daughter before, and made it a cause of, Apicata's letter to

Tiberius, Tacitus placed it some time later ('vanescente quamquam plebis ira ac plerisque per priora supplicia lenitis') and this is exactly what the *Fasti Ostienses* show to have been the truth. Sejanus, his elder son, and Apicata died in the second half of October; the younger son and the daughter some time in December.

On the bigger question—whether in fact in A.D. 23 Livia poisoned her husband—as Tacitus, like Dio, says that she did—argument is, as it always has been, entirely subjective. The 'facts' of the murder are given by Tacitus. If, like Eisenhut, you do not accept them, that is because of your general view of human nature and of human probabilities: whether what a doctor and a 'spado' said under torture is likely to have been the truth; whether a wife is likely to have learnt the secret of a husband who had discarded her and whether, if so, she is likely to have preserved her life and to have kept the secret for eight years; and so on. *Chacun à son*—in this case—*début*. The *Fasti Ostienses* bring nothing to the solution of that problem.

J. P. V. D. BALSDON

Exeter College, Oxford

A PROPOS D'UN COMPTE RENDU (THE BUDÉ THEOGNIS)

IL est des critiques qui, malgré la confusion où elles nous plongent un instant, ne provoquent de notre part aucun geste de défense, aucune réplique: c'est qu'elles sont mesurées, véridiques, impartiales. Tel n'est assurément pas le mérite du compte rendu qu'a fait paraître ici-même Mr. D. C. C. Young sur mon *Theognis* (*Class. Rev.*, lxiv, April 1950, pp. 14-16). Mr. Young a sans doute le droit de penser du mal de cet ouvrage, et de le dire; mais au moins une critique aussi défavorable que la sienne devrait-elle s'appuyer sur des observations pertinentes et matériellement exactes. Ce n'est pas toujours le cas: il n'en est, pour ainsi dire, pas une qui ne passe, peu ou prou, les justes limites, et je ne puis m'empêcher d'en reprendre ici l'essentiel.

Mr. Young veut montrer (p. 14, col. 2) l'insuffisance de mon étude de la tradition manuscrite. Il rappelle que j'ai groupé ensemble les mss. b d f h m n p, et ajoute que j'ai renvoyé, pour établir leur accord, à onze passages du texte, savoir 124, 185, 188, 223,

236, 258, 259, 440, 491, 497, 1128. Or six de ces passages, fait-il remarquer, laissent, au contraire de ce que j'affirme, apparaître certaines divergences (p. ex. 440 αὐτοῦ p, αὐτοῦ b d f h m n). Mais Mr. Young m'a-t-il bien lu? Car en réalité j'ai dûment pris soin, à ce même endroit de mon exposé (p. 17, ll. 4-5), de mettre à part, dans le groupe ainsi constitué, le ms. p, 'où se trahit l'influence d'une tradition plus ancienne', et de l'exclure ainsi de la démonstration qui suit. Naturellement, l'opposition de p aux autres membres de ce groupe est la seule qui se manifeste dans la plupart des cas examinés par mon censeur (124, 440, 491, 497)¹, dont la critique et la conclusion moqueuse (p. 14, col. 2, ll. 14-16) se trouvent, de ce fait, assez mal justifiées.

Presque tout le reste est à l'avenant. Mr. Young se garde de dire que j'ai, malgré tout, dans ce groupe de manuscrits, distingué deux rameaux, b f m et d h n (p. 17, fin). Passons sur la chicane qu'il me cherche à propos de la ressemblance des titres de d, h et n (voir pourtant sa Digression, ll. 8-10, et cf. la note 4 de ma page 17). Il ne manque pas, dans son article, d'autres remarques plus surprenantes de la part d'un philologue aussi averti. Ma correction de 296 (ἀγδής) est-elle tellement malheureuse, et suis-je le premier à proposer une leçon où s'observe une synizèse (cf. Bergk au v. 584)? — L'un des sens connus de χάρις (822) n'est-il pas celui de *considération, estime* (cf. Xénoph. An. 5. 7. 28, et *passim*) que je lui attribue, mais que ne connaît justement pas ὥρις, le mot auquel ma traduction, paraît-il, fait penser? — Mr. Young condamne, sans s'expliquer, mon interprétation du v. 391: bien fin qui saura imposer la sienne, et j'en connais jusqu'ici trois différentes. — Je n'ai nulle part rejeté, comme il le prétend (p. 15, col. 2), les conclusions de la *Première Partie* de mon *Étude*, pas plus dans ma *Seconde Partie* qu'à la page viii de mon *Introduction* (ll. 23-24 '... quelque créance que mérite à nos yeux notre conclusion sur le texte...'), et je me range très résolument, et non 'halfheartedly', parmi les χαρίζοντες (cf. *Conclusion*, pp. 289-92). — L'argument que Mr. Young tire de Sapho fr. 90 D. contre ces mêmes χαρίζοντες est d'avance réfuté par les observations de Jacoby et surtout de Kroll (*Theognis-Interpret.*, pp. 19-21) auxquelles renvoie, dans

¹ On m'accordera, j'espère, qu'au v. 124 la bonne leçon πάντων de p s'oppose aussi bien au πάν de d h n qu'au πάν de b f m, ces deux dernières leçons provenant visiblement de la même faute initiale. — En 497, je lis, dans d, τοιοῦτος et non τοι οὗτος.

mon ouvrage, la note qu'il cite et qu'il reprend.

Il y aurait encore plus à dire. Mais il faut se borner. Je me contenterai donc d'une dernière remarque, bien significative, sur les lignes que mon critique consacre à la note de Suidas *ἐγγραφεν ἐλεγείαν εἰς τοὺς σωθέτας τῶν Συρακουσίων ἐν τῇ πολιορκίᾳ* et à l'explication que j'en ai donnée. Mr. Young peut bien penser qu'il s'agit là du siège de Mégare Hybléenne par Gélon (483) — ce qui ne va pas d'ailleurs, à mon sens, sans difficulté. Mais ce qui est étrange, c'est que, pour me montrer la faiblesse de ma thèse (car je tiens qu'il s'agit d'un siège *subi par* Syracuse), Mr. Young écrive ironiquement ceci: 'If a Frenchman of Algiers or Quebec wrote a poem "A ceux qui ont échappé aux mains des Allemands dans l'invasion", would it refer to an invasion of Germany?' Ne voit-il pas que son ingénieuse transposition n'est pas fidèle? Le 'qui ont échappé aux mains des Allemands' ne répond au τοὺς σωθέτας τῶν Συρακουσίων de Suidas que si l'on prête à l'expression grecque le sens, *grammaticalement fort improbable*, et, en fait, très rarement proposé, de 'ceux qui ont échappé aux Syracusains' au lieu de 'ceux des Syracusains qui ont échappé...' — ce qui change toutes les données du problème. — Ce spécieux appel au bon sens tient quelque peu du sophisme...

Tout cela ne m'empêchera pas de lire avec intérêt l'ouvrage de Mr. Young, lorsqu'il aura paru. Je lui souhaite bien bonne chance pour l'étude des manuscrits inférieurs dont il nous parle et dont j'aurais parfois, quant à moi, jugé l'examen inutile même si la guerre et l'après-guerre ne m'en eussent interdit l'approche. Espérons qu'il en tirera d'utiles enseignements, qu'en particulier il établira de façon péremptoire la parfaite unité de cette œuvre théognidéenne — suspecte depuis quatre siècles déjà et dont Mr. Harrison lui-même a fini par n'être plus très sûr!

J. CARRIÈRE

Université de Toulouse

[Mr. D. C. C. Young writes: Professor Carrière's *Étude sur Theognis* is so valuable a contribution to the discussion of Theognidean problems that I am the more sorry to

² La construction de σφίζω avec un génitif sans préposition est poétique. Mr. Harrison, qu'une telle interprétation aurait tenté, ne l'a crue possible qu'à la condition d'introduire dans notre texte un ἀπό qui n'y est pas.

have pained him by my discharge of the duty to point out defects in his parergon, the Budé text. Briefly to repel his objections in their order:

1. C.'s language and punctuation on p. 17 except the manuscript β from his 'premier groupe' only in respect of its lacking red initials. A partial stirring of the *pulvisculus* of the *deteriores* illuminates little, but my 'conclusion moqueuse' was based on C.'s whole apparatus.

2. C.'s conjecture of ἀηδής at v. 296, with the unparalleled synzesis of αη, is poorly defended by a German conjecture at v. 584 involving the rare synzesis of αε.

3. In v. 822 χάρη is most easily taken in the same idiomatic sense as in Th. 152, where C. renders 'qu'il veut anéantir'. In the Xenophon passages χάρα means rather 'official ranking, military grade' than 'esteem'. I apologize for wondering if C. had followed Hecker, Hartung, Corais in reading ᾠρη, which I agree can hardly mean 'esteem'.

4. In v. 391 κακὸν δὲ οὐδὲν εἶπεν can scarcely mean anything but 'And no evil is like it' (χρημοσύνη). How can it mean 'Il ne sait plus reconnaître le mal'?

5. On p. viii of his *Étude* C. guardedly tells us: 'Nous n'aurons garde . . . de considérer cette *Seconde Partie* comme étroitement conditionnée, dans sa mise en œuvre, par les conclusions de la première — d'y négliger, systématiquement, par exemple, tels ou tels poèmes suspects', . . . 'nous ne pouvons, quelque créance que mérite à nos yeux notre conclusion sur le texte, rompre aussitôt, et d'un seul coup, avec une tradition malgré tout respectable' (namely that of Theognidean unity). After 134 pages arguing that our text is a synthesis of collections in which the true original Theognis is swamped among alien accretions of several centuries, C. gives us a further 152, in which he compiles morphological, metrical, and other statistics on a unitary basis, unlike such a consistent Chorizon as Kuellenberg, who confined his statistics to portions held to be

authentic. C. stresses alike the stylistic consistency of the *ensemble* (pp. 281 ff.) and the 'forte personnalité' of Theognis (p. 292), positions reconcilable only on the unlikely assumption that accretions came from authors of indistinguishable personality or from perfect imitators. In practice and by implication C. in his second part rejects, by not acting upon, the conclusions of his first. For all that his *Étude* is in many ways admirable and helpful.

6. C. summons Jacoby and Kroll to defend his view that the 'rapprochement des Muses et des Grâces' cannot be much earlier than the fourth century. Their arguments prove, if anything, only this, that, while the Muses and Graces are found together as early as Sappho, it is Theognis who first makes them *sing* together.

7. On Suidas' statement, admittedly the simple genitive with σφίζεσθαι is poetic, but Theognis was a poet, and Suid. may well hand on his original title. What relevant siege has there in which some of the Syracusans escaped? As the name of the besieged city is omitted, one assumes it to be a city with which the poet was connected. Th. was a Megarian, belonging to a colonizing people. The Syracusans did not besiege his native Nisaeon Megara, but did sack Hyblaeon M., towards the end of his lifetime. If the Megarian poet entitled his elegy 'To the refugees from the Syracusans in the siege', everyone would know whom he meant. My analogy with the sea-severed French-speaking communities is not perfect, but is surely illustrative enough. My interpretation of Suidas' statement reconciles it with all other data about Th.'s life.

8. While aware of E. Harrison's Cartesian doubts, I am fortified in my unitarianism by that of the most eminent Hellenist who has gone thoroughly into Theognis, T. W. Allen, whose posthumous papers, now appearing in *Rev. de Philologie*, are vigorously anti-Chorizontic.]

REVIEWS

THE FRAGMENTS OF CALLIMACHUS

R. PFEIFFER: Callimachus. Volumen I: *Fragmenta*. Pp. xiv + 520. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. Cloth, 50s. net.

NEARLY twenty-eight years have elapsed since the present reviewer contributed to this journal a notice of Dr. Pfeiffer's *Callimachi Fragmenta Nuper Reperita*. That slim volume and the editor's *Kallimachosstudien*, published a year earlier, established Pfeiffer's reputation as a Callimachean scholar of the first rank and they were followed by a series of articles on each new discovery soon after its publication which invariably illuminated the often considerable darkness. But all the time European and American scholars awaited impatiently the definitive edition of all the fragments, new and old, which Pfeiffer was so clearly destined to produce. Now at last it is offered to the public, and we congratulate not only the industrious and ingenious editor but also the Clarendon Press which has responded so generously and so successfully to the demands made on it. The present volume includes all the fragments of Schneider's edition (1873), all published since then, and by the courtesy of the Egypt Exploration Society important extracts from an unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyrus which contains an edition of Callimachus furnished with learned and abundant scholia. This new material comes chiefly from *The Lock of Berenice* and *The Victory of Sosibius*, but the papyrus also contributes something to the elucidation of the *Hecale*.

In the course of his labours on the fragments Pfeiffer was encouraged by the Delegates of the Clarendon Press to undertake a fresh edition of the *Hymns* and *Epigrams*, a work much to be desired in view of the new material for the *Hymns* which has come to light since Wilamowitz published his text, and it is hoped that this second volume, which will also contain prolegomena and indexes to the whole work, will appear fairly shortly. There are of course drawbacks in this separate publication, especially the absence of indexes from Vol. I, but the editor was clearly right not to hold up the fragments any longer, and the present feast will certainly satisfy the heartiest appetite.

All the world knows how great has been the contribution of Mr. Lobel to the study of Callimachus both by editing new texts and by re-editing old. Pfeiffer naturally owes him a great deal, as he freely acknowledges, but it is clear that the debt is not confined to one side. In fact the circumstances which brought about the co-operation at Oxford of these two scholars have proved singularly profitable to Callimachean studies. Nor must the share of Dr. P. Maas be forgotten, who, in addition to reading the proofs, was always available in Oxford for consultation. There has resulted from all this a work of surpassing interest, in which erudition and accuracy are matched by sound judgement and constructive criticism. Pfeiffer knows his Greek grammarians and lexicographers as well as any man can, and in the Latin notes, placed below the text and apparatus criticus on each page, the *testimonia* and other relevant matter are nearly always given in full with a wealth of interesting comment, so that an *ἀοικνὸς ἀνὴρ* might almost write a history of Greek lexicography from a study of the notes. Pfeiffer is never discursive, and it is a great help to have these rather inaccessible texts printed verbatim, but perhaps if the editor had been less liberal here he might have been somewhat less austere on occasion in his

exposition of the texts and in making suggestions for their completion, but perhaps not, since it is clear that his reserve is based on principle.

It is no disparagement of Pfeiffer's achievement to point out that many old problems remain unsolved, while the newest texts contribute more than their fair share of difficulties. Indeed, his edition should be regarded as a challenge to scholars (including reviewers!) to exert their wits now that all the material is at last set out so fully and clearly in one volume instead of being scattered over numerous publications often hard to obtain. It is in this spirit that I venture to put forward the following *templementa*.

Fr. 7. 19-21. Pfeiffer rightly rejects the supplements of N.-V. and the correction of Maas in l. 21. The subjunctive *σεβίζη* demands a preceding conjunction, probably temporal ('whenever'). Read, for example, *εἴθ' ἢ γε τὸν Ἡρακλῆα σεβίζη*, where *ἢ γε* refers to Lindos. Restore *ἡδίστην* at the beginning and transfer the comma from l. 20 to follow this word. For the sense cf. Heracles' remark that *οὐδέποτε . . . θοίνης ἡδίωνος ἀπολαῦσαι ἢ τῆς μετὰ τῶν ἀρῶν* (Conon quoted by Pfeiffer, *Kallimachosstudien*, pp. 90-91 with other authorities). *Α[υκίω]* (Maas) or the like should then be read in l. 19.

Fr. 7. 27-30. Pfeiffer's suggestion that the words *ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔκτανον* in the Berlin Commentary imply *ἔκταν* in the text is acceptable, but his proposal to read it at the end of l. 29 is not. I suggest for 29-30 *ἢ κακὰ μοι κακὸν ἔθνος Ἱήονες ἄλλα μὲν ἔρξα[ν], / [Ἀψυρτον δ' ἔκταν.] πάντα δ' ἀνατράπελα* (sc. *ἐγένετο*). In l. 27 N.-V. suggested *Ἀψυρτος δ' ἔθνησκ[εν]*. I should prefer *Μηδείη θ' ἄμ' ἔφευγ[εν]*, but if N.-V. are right, *τηλύγετον* might be read for *Ἀψυρτον* in l. 30.

Fr. 43. 72-3. The traces seem reconcilable with *ὁ μὲν θέ[λε] μόνος ἀρ[έ]σθαι / [κ]λη[ί]β[ο]ν* ('wished to take the credit alone'). *Ib.* 90-2. In l. 90 *Κλ[ω]θε* suggested by Pfeiffer seems inevitable. Read perhaps *Κλ[ω]θε δὲ τί κρήνη(ι) Ῥάδα μάθω[s ἀμφέσ]τ[ητη]ν* = 'And why two Fates were placed round the fountain of Rh.', the reference being possibly to two statues of the Fates. L. 91 must then be taken in apposition to l. 90. In l. 92 *ἐν δὲ νυ τοῖσι* needs a preceding reference; cf. fr. 178. 5. I suggest, for example, *πο[λ]λ[λ]ὰ μὲν, ἐν δὲ νυ τοῖσι σοφόν τότε τῇν [πολύδριν or τόσον ἴδριν / εἰρώτων]*.

Fr. 59. 16-17. Pfeiffer's supplement *ἐλαχ[ύς]* with *δόρπος* following is attractive. I suggest, for example, *ἐξέσθην ἐλαχ[ύς] τε Μολόρ[χειος] παρέκεντο / δόρπος· ὁ δ' εἰλαπίνη[ι] θυμὸν ἀρ[έ]σσάμενος*.

Fr. 80-83. Pfeiffer's piecing together of the fragments from the story of Phrygius and Pieria is a brilliant achievement, though he did not observe that Fr. 82 completes Fr. 80. On the basis of the corresponding passages in Aristaeus and Plutarch, perhaps read in Fr. 80. 12-13 *εἰ γὰρ ἐμοὶ νέυσειας ὅτ[ε] χρήζοιμι νέεσθαι / [ἐς πόλιν ὀλβίστην τήνδε μετὰ πλεόνων]*, *ib.* 15 *νύμφα, τεῇ σπονδὰς πατρίδι μαιομένης*, and in Fr. 83. 2-3 *κῆτι μένει λόγος οὗτο[s] Ἰωνί[σιν]* "εἴ με φιλοῖ / νυμφίος, ὡς Φρύγιος [τε]ίμ[ε]ε Πιε[ρίην]".

Fr. 90. The *φαρμακός* may be the speaker. Read *ἐνθ', Ἀβδηρ', οὐ νῦν μ[ε] π[η]λέω[ν] φαρμακὸν ἀγνιεῖ*, perhaps continuing *[ὠνήτῶν βασιλεὺς δὴ τιν' ὑπὲρ πόλιος]*.

Fr. 91. The sense of the opening couplet may have been 'Ino after Learchus' death reduced to one child, Melicertes, was eager to die.' If so, read *α[ἰ]ῶν', ὦ Μελίκερτα, μῆς ἐπὶ πότνια Βύνη / [ἀγκύρης ἡδὴ σεύετ' ἐοῦσα λιπεῖν]*.

Fr. 110 (*Πλόκαμος*). The fresh evidence cannot be discussed here as it deserves, but note the new readings, especially in 45, 51, 54-5, 65 ff., 77-8,

93-4; the absence of an equivalent for 79-88 of Catullus; and the presence of two new lines, 94^a and 94^b, at the end saluting Berenice. I content myself with suggesting that ll. 71-2 may have run *μή [τάδε μοι] κοτέση[ς, 'Ραμνονοῖς· οὐτ' ἴς ἐρύξει / βούς ἔπος [ὅς γλώσσῃς] προ[λλάκι λὰξ ἐπ' ἐβη]*.

Fr. 176 and 177. Pfeiffer's conjecture that these come from the same column and same elegy is undoubtedly correct and so is his suggestion (*Addenda* on *Fr.* 84-6) that the *Muscipula* was the first elegy in Book IV. In the *Diegesis* to that poem perhaps read *ῥόπ[τηρην]*. I hope to deal with the *Muscipula* elsewhere, but may remark here that *Fr.* 176. 3 should indeed be completed from *fr.* 590, but not as Pfeiffer suggests. A father, I think, is instructing his son in house- and farm-work. Read, for example, *ὦδ' ὥσε πάλιν πυρὶ δειπνον [έτοιμον / παρθεῖναι]* (= 'to feed the fire again').

Fr. 186. 1-2. Read, for example, *βρεχμὸν γὰρ ἐπώμοσας, ὅττι μέγ[ιστον] / ὄρκιόν ἐστ', "ἡ μήν]*. Callimachus is addressing Zeus. *Ib.* 3-4. The sense requires verbs in the future and the stop after *ἐτήσια* must be justified. Read, for example, *ἀξουσιν ἐτήσια· σὺν δεκαταίῳ / [αἶ γέ διοίσουσι]*. *Ib.* 11. Cf. *fr.* 675 and read *'Ελλήνων τά γε πρῶτα Πελασγικὸν [ἔδραν Ἑλλάνων]*.

The Iambi remain full of problems, but in Iambus i. 41 (*Fr.* 191) an old difficulty may be solved by a new punctuation, if we write *ἔστῃσε τοῦ κλυτῆρος, εἶχε γὰρ δεσμός, / μέλλοντας κτλ.* Bathycles was bedridden owing to stiffening of the joints. For *δεσμός ἄρθρου* = *ankylosis* L. & S. cite *Hp. Fract.* 37. In Iambus xiii. 35 (*Fr.* 203) read *διφρα καὶ τράπ[εζα(ν)]*, cf. *Dieg.* ix. 37, and *ib.* 39 *κῆν τὸ μῆκ[ος] ἐλλείπει*. Pfeiffer's treatment of the *Lyrica* is rather disappointing. More could have been done to elucidate the *Branchus* and his text and interpretation of the *Arsinoe* in the main merely repeat his first edition. In particular he is mistaken, in my opinion, about the content of Philotera's speech (58-65). The *πόσις* is not Hephæstus, but Philadelphus, the *Μακρόβιοι* are not those of Mt. Athos, but the Ethiopians, and Philotera refers to Philadelphus' expedition into Ethiopia mentioned by Diodorus Siculus i. 37. 5. The *Hecale* is still the most obscure of Callimachus' poems but Pfeiffer is at his best in editing these elusive fragments. In *Fr.* 383 (the new elegy on a Nemean victory), 5-6 Pfeiffer seems right in seeing a reference to Helen's Island and Canopus. I suggest *εἰς 'Ελένη[ς νησιῶδα καὶ ἥ ποτὲ νηὸς ἔθαψεν] / ποιμένα [Τανταλίδης, the νηὸς ποιμήν being Canopus and Τανταλίδης Menelaus]*. In *Fr.* 384 (Victory of Sosibius), 5 perhaps read *ἔτι χυρὸν [οὔσαι κείνου]* and complete the schol. on 5-6 to *ἵππος τοῖς ὠσί . . .*

Much more could be said and nearly all of it would be complimentary. The *Manes* of Callimachus will surely welcome this *μέγα βιβλίον*.

Exeter College, Oxford

E. A. BARBER

OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XIX. Edited with translation and notes by E. LOBEL, E. P. WEGENER, C. H. ROBERTS, and H. I. BELL. Pp. xv+180; 13 plates. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1948. Cloth and boards, 50s. net.

PART XVIII of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri appeared in 1941. The interval between its publication and that of Part XIX is presumably due to the diffi-

culties of the war and post-war period, not to lack of material. As usual, the present volume is divided between literary (pp. 1-80) and documentary (pp. 81-143) texts. There are also additions and corrections (pp. 144-54) to pieces published in this and earlier volumes. Among the new classical fragments pride of place goes deservedly to Callimachus. **2208-18** furnish new texts from the *Aitia*, Iambi, and *Hecale*. By the happy collaboration of Mr. Lobel and Dr. Pfeiffer all these new fragments with many ingenious combinations and improvements have been included in the latter's Callimachus, vol. i, *Fragmenta* (Oxford, 1949). The following remarks are, therefore, in the main confined to pieces which reappear without any major change in Pfeiffer's edition: the references to Pfeiffer are given in brackets after the number of the papyrus.

2208, Fr. 1 (Fr. 2) comes from the end of the prologue to the *Aitia* and reveals that the description of Hesiod's meeting with the Muses was followed by references to the contents of the *Theogony* and *Works*; l. 5 paraphrases *Works* 265 and ll. 6 ff. seem to paraphrase 286-92 (ll. 7-8 may have run τὸ γὰρ καλὸν οὐ μάλ' ἐτοῖμον, / τὰδίκ]α δὲ πρήσσειν εὖμα[ρές or εὖπα[λές]. In l. 6 perhaps read αἰῶ = αἰῶνα. **2208**, Fr. 3, combined with **2211**, fr. 2 v. and **2212**, fr. 19, is now Fr. 114 in Pfeiffer; it consists of a dialogue between the poet and the statue of Apollo at Delos made by Angelion and Tectaeus, in which the god answers Callimachus' questions about the special features of the statue, a device copied of course by Ovid in the *Fasti*. **2209A** (Fr. 21) comes from the Argonautic episode in the *Aitia* and describes the origin of the abusive sacrificial rite at Anaphe. In ll. 5-6 perhaps ἥρωες δῆπειτα] μετὰ δμωῖσι[ν ἔθνον, / ἄς λάβειν ἐκ μεγάρου] ξείνιον Ἀλκινόου, cf. Ap. Rhod. iv. 1221-2 and correct reference in Lobel's note. **2209B** (Fr. 118) refers to the building and rebuilding of a temple, which, despite the caution of Lobel and Pfeiffer, can hardly be other than that of Apollo at Delphi. The lines probably mention three successive temples, viz. the old one burnt in 548 (in l. 2 perhaps τὸ δ' ἱερὸν ὅττι κέκαντο), the Alcmaeonid, and that of the fourth century. In l. 9 the remains ἀμφιπερικ[are best taken as part of some case of ἀμφιπερικτιόνης used *metri gratia* for Ἀμφικτιόνης and denoting the members of the Amphictyonic League who supplied the ναοποιοί on the last occasion. **2211**, Fr. 1 v. and Fr. 1 r., the longest piece, contains (i) (Fr. 63) 12 lines from an *Aition* connected with the Attic Thesmophoria, which seem unworthy of Callimachus; (ii) (Fr. 64) 18 lines from another on the tomb of Simonides (in l. 5 perhaps ἱφικ]ατ' οὖν ἤρπυεν); (iii) (Fr. 66) 9 lines covering the end of a poem on the fountains of Argos; (iv) (Fr. 67) the 20-odd opening lines of the famous story of Acontius and Cydippe, καλοὶ νησάων ἀστέρες ἀμφοτέροι, as Callimachus describes them. The first 14 lines of the last-named poem are preserved almost intact, the rest are fragmentary. Comparison with Aristaenetus, *Ep.* 1. 10 τὴν μὲν ἅπασιν τοῖς ἐαντὶς φιλοτίμοις κεκόσμηκεν Ἀφροδίτη, μόνου τοῦ κεστοῦ φεισαμένη suggests that ll. 15-16 may have run Νάξε, τεθαμβ]ήκης, [ἤ]ν δ' ἔκοτασις· οὕτως αὐτῇ / [φείσατο πλ]ῆν κερ[τοῦ Κύνρι]ς ἔχεν ἱ[ε]ροῦ, or alternatively, if the scribe did not intend a stop at the end of l. 16, οὕτως αὐτῇς / [τιμῆς πλ]ῆν κερ[τοῦ Κύνρι]ς ἔχεν ἱ[ε]ροῦ / [φείσατο Κυδ]ίππῃ. **2213**, Fr. 8 (Fr. 85) comes from the story of Euthycles. In l. 13, where Lobel leaves a blank before the letters ριγν, Pfeiffer has since completed to τ]ῷ σφίσιν ἐν χαλεπῇ θῆ[κε τελεσφο]ρίην from *Hymn* ii. 78, but there θῆκε τελεσφορίην means 'established a ceremony' and it seems most unlikely that the same words could here mean 'made (difficult) the maturing of the crops'. Perhaps read θῆ[κε κακοσπο]ρίην or θῆ[κεν ἐπισπο]ρίην.

2214 (Fr. 186) concerns the gifts of the Hyperboreans to Delos and raises many interesting questions which cannot be discussed here. In l. 31 read *χαῖρε μέγα κρείο[ν]σα*, cf. *Hymn* iii. 268. **2215**, Fr. 1 (Fr. 193) and Fr. 2 (Fr. 194) are from the Iambi, and so is **2218** (Fr. 202) now definitely assigned by Pfeiffer to Iambus xii as the opening lines. It is by the way worth considering whether the mother of the baby girl, whose birth is celebrated in this last poem, should not be identified with the Lycaenis of Epigram 53 in view of the similarity of the circumstances. **2216** and **2217** come from the *Hecale*; but unfortunately throw little, if any, light on the general plan of that poem and raise several new problems. **2219** and **2220** contain scraps of Euphorion's poems, perhaps the *Διώνυσος*, *Ἡσίοδος*, and *Χιλιάδες*. More interesting is **2221**, which consists of two columns of thirty lines each from a commentary with *lemmata* on Nicander, *Theriaca* 377-95. The text offers some variations from the manuscript tradition, and the commentator, a man of learning, perhaps Theon, quotes Hesiod (*Works* 38 ff.), Sophocles (*Ποιμένες*), Callimachus (Iambus ix, 1-2), and possibly another work of Nicander. **2222** comprises two fragments of a chronological list (early 1st cent. A.D.) of the later Ptolemies.

Extant classical authors are represented by **2223** and **2224**, which contain Euripides, *Bacchae* 1070-1136 and *Hippolytus* 597-604 respectively (the former text has been used by Professor Dodds for his (Oxford, 1944) edition of the *Bacchae*), and by **2225** and **2226**. The first of these is a fragmentary text of Callimachus, *Hymn* iv. 11-218, which, although it supplies the missing beginnings of 200-1 and end of 200, raises more problems than it solves. The second covers *Hymn* vi. 32-end, again in fragmentary form. New readings of interest, some already conjectured by scholars, are 80 *δακρύοισα*, 84 *ἀλλοτρία*, 92 *μέσ'* *ἐπὶ*, 93 *ῥινός*, 106 *οὐδέν*, 110 *μάλουργιν* ('white-tail', cf. Hesych. s.v.), 111 *μέσση μὲν ἐν*.

The documentary texts, edited with a wealth of critical and historical comment, make an attractive selection. To the layman the most interesting are perhaps **2234**, a petition to a centurion by a man who alleges damage and assault by fishermen and a soldier; **2235**, another petition, which illustrates contemporary economic difficulties; and **2244**, which relates to the supply of axles for water-wheels.

The Egypt Exploration Society and the learned editors are to be congratulated on having maintained and added to the great reputation of the series.

Exeter College, Oxford

E. A. BARBER

THE ATTHIS

F. JACOBY: *Atthis: the Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*. Pp. viii+431. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. Cloth, 35s. net.

THIS is a book of the first importance by one of the most learned and respected of scholars. Its form seems to me deplorable, and, just because the book is important, something must be said about it. The main text takes 225 pages, the notes 172: which, being closely printed, are equal to about 270 of the other. They are all collected at the end, to make in fact a second part to the volume. How is one meant to read them? In the order in which the book is printed? This is impossible, for much that is in the notes is necessary for the understand-

ing, or at least for the appreciation, of the text; and in any case they do not make continuous reading. So we must be for ever turning from the first to the second part, maybe a dozen times to a page, sometimes to a note pages long most of which should be in the text, sometimes to a mere cross-reference, now for a digression, now for a detail, or again for an argument in justification. It was Cornford, I believe, who first protested against this form of book, which was invented by amateurs who wished to appear scholars by having learned notes, and adopted by scholars who wished to appear amateurs by having a clean page. No such charge can be brought against Dr. Jacoby; but the evil of the method is greater than the mere discomfort of the reader. Notes should contain (apart from references, which indeed might as well be in the text) only digressions; and digressions, naturally, should be few. We have all been guilty of putting into notes what should be in the text, either from inability to think clearly and arrange our material tidily, or we have afterthoughts and are too lazy to rewrite; and it is certainly not for me to cast a stone. But when we use footnotes, very shame prevents us from increasing their length or their number beyond a certain limit: put all notes at the end, and we are free to stray as we will. So it has happened here: monstrous long notes containing the very stuff of his argument, too many digressions, positive statements on such matters as the principles of historiography or of Herodotus or Thucydides, repetitions (especially in polemic)—they are all there. Jacoby says he has 'confined' polemic as far as possible to the notes; what does he hope to gain by that? The last section of the book is called 'Conclusion' and is a good statement of Jacoby's position; but the notes are as long as ever, one of them a digression on Athens in the *Catalogue* (beginning 'the facts are well known'; so, one is tempted to add, is the dogmatic assertion); another, the last of all, is a restatement of his views (in themselves very interesting) about the Roman Annalists—as though he knew his book was coming to an end, and he must get in a few more notes. Only someone wanting to see Jacoby's views on some particular point could use the book with comfort; yet it is not a work of reference. It is a great pity; for in his main text, and in his notes individually, Jacoby writes clearly enough, and knows well how to marshal his thoughts.¹

All, however, who are interested in Greek history should read the book (including the notes). His thesis is an interesting one, a development of suggestions made on different occasions in the past: there was not in Athens (or in other Greek cities) any pre-literary chronicle, e.g. a chronological list of officials with 'notes' of contemporary events attached to their names, which was later put into literary form by the *Atthidographi*, only bare lists, certainly of the archons (going back at least to Solon, probably to Creon), very likely of priests too, later of the *strategi*; the *exegetae*, about whom Jacoby has a very full discussion, had certain limited duties, of interpretation of phenomena and direction on certain rites, but they had nothing to do with any chronicle or history; Herodotus was the first to record, more or less systematically, Attic history from 560 to 481, and he got it from oral tradition, living memory, and had no dates, because the archon-list, though in existence in some form, was not

¹ I will present Dr. Jacoby with a footnote of my own. Gibbon, writing of the Swiss edition of the *Decline and Fall*, said: 'of their fourteen octavo volumes, the two last include the whole body of the notes. The public

importunity had forced me to remove them from the end of the volume to the bottom of the page; but I have often repented of my compliance' (*Memoirs*, ed. Birkbeck Hill, 1900, p. 233).

available to him—it was not made public till recorded on stone c. 425 (the fragmentary inscription from the agora); Hellanicus, writing the first *Atthis* c. 400, in annalistic form, took Herodotus' narrative for this period and added the archons' names where possible—e.g. the thirty-six years of continuous rule of Pisistratus and Hippias (Jacoby adopts this interpretation of Hdt. v. 65. 3) and the three years' interval between the assassination of Hipparchus and the end of the tyranny, were from the oral tradition, and the archons' names could be taken from the list if the latest was known (but how was *this* known?); he himself practically created the earlier history, from Cecrops to Solon, with big gaps between Codrus and the late seventh century, from a variety of scattered material, very little being from the epic; and the later Atthidographi (Clidemus, the first of them, writing c. 350) adopted in all essentials Hellanicus' matter and form, giving only ever-increasing space to recent and contemporary history. These men were definitely historians, with the inevitable political standpoint of historians (differing one from the other), not antiquarians; as much historians as the writers of *Hellenica*; and their 'centre of gravity' was 'in the history of the writer's time, not in the past, and not in antiquities'. *Hellenica* preceded in time local histories.

All this, and more, is excellently done: well argued and documented, with a wealth of learning and idea such as we expect from Jacoby; with some ingenious theory (such as that of the institution of the ἐξηγηταὶ πυθόχρηστοι) and some one-sided statements, as that Greek historians used documents, if at all, for contemporary rather than for past history (Herodotus and Thucydides did not); much rubbish is cleared away, and his criticism of others, especially of Wilamowitz and Lenschau, is generally convincing. I liked particularly his treatment of the idea that you can 'explain the origin' of a book by supposing a predecessor almost exactly like it, an *Ur-Herodot*, or the Atthidographus Anonymus of 380 B.C. It is when he goes beyond this that he frequently fails to convince. He too thinks that we must explain why no *Atthis* followed Hellanicus for fifty years, and just why the first Athenian wrote one c. 350, and none was written after 262: the Atthidographi not only, as historians, had a political standpoint, but they wrote to produce a political effect; they were democrats and anti-Macedonian, as Clidemus, or 'conservatives', as Androtion—whose depreciation of Solon (*Atth.* 6. 2 being taken as from Androtion) and whittling away of the *seisachtheia* almost to vanishing point were due not simply to political bias, but to a desire to promote, by his *Atthis*, the conservative *πάτριος πολιτεία* of his own day. I can find no evidence for this, and Androtion could have reached his goal by better means than writing another book beginning with Cecrops and repeating what his predecessors had said about the kings and the life-archons and the rest; and even if it were true, it does not explain why no Athenian wrote an *Atthis* before 350. (Why did good tragedy die with Sophocles, political comedy with Aristophanes?) Jacoby, contrasting the Atthidographi, with their strong political feelings, with the contemporary writers of *Hellenica*—'who had not a country of their own, or had lost it or given it up'—says: 'anyone not afraid of a manifestly imperfect comparison might place Androtion at the side of Sallust, and Philochorus at the side of Tacitus; there was no Livy among the Atthidographers'. But neither Sallust nor Tacitus wrote *historiae ab urbe condita*. Moreover, the Atthidographi used a non-literary style (because this was the 'rule'—established by whom?—for this species of writing); so the comparison with Sallust is indeed imperfect. Else-

where the comparison is made with Livy; and we read that for Philochorus Athens was as central as Rome for Livy: 'though living at a time at which the Greeks were masters of the world then existing' he 'had to such a degree remained the Athenian that he believed it possible to write history from the narrow standpoint of a city no longer regnant'. I feel sure that this is seriously to misunderstand the spirit of Greek local history. So does Jacoby's insistence on Hellanicus being a foreigner in Athens, especially in such a sentence as this: 'we may also compare (although with greater reserve) the fact that Greek historiography about Rome preceded Roman and gave the (or an) incitement to it, as the foreign scholar Hellanikos did to Attic Atthidography'.

There are other discussions, all important for his thesis, in which the argument is weak: that Hellanicus (whose champion Jacoby has made himself) and Herodotus could owe nothing, for Attic history, to Pherecydes or Hecataeus (the fact that 'later authors cite not Pherekydes but Hellanikos' is of no significance, as Jacoby himself shows elsewhere—he has much that is good about the nature of our citations); that Hellanicus followed Herodotus in ignoring, almost, the work of Solon; that the discrepancy between the two versions of the overthrow of the tyranny on which Thucydides comments (one of which, that which named Hipparchus as a tyrant and gave all the credit to Harmodius and Aristogiton, is for Jacoby official and democratic) led to the date 511–510 for the assassination in the Atthis, which was thus capable of 'palpable falsification' in the party interest (this is only to save the authority of *Marmor Parium*; yet the dialogue *Hipparchus*, the chief evidence for the 'official' version, implies the right dates). I do not believe that either Herodotus or Thucydides 'deliberately omitted' Megacles' name in his account of Cylon. What Thucydides' motive was I cannot imagine; Herodotus, alas, must on every occasion uphold the cause and the dignity of the Alcmeonidae, in the story of Alcmeon and Croesus as elsewhere. The λόγοι ἄνδρες from whom Herodotus learned so much were, we are told, those who knew the oral traditions; but they were also men well versed in the written word, including documents, as in Egypt. Jacoby often speaks of the Atthidographi as members of the 'upper classes', and so, most of them, 'conservative'; if this means that they were of good birth, there is of course no evidence for it; if it means, as it seems to sometimes, that they were lettered men and not simple peasants, it is true, but meaningless. It is misleading to put all πολιτεῖαι Ἀθηναίων, Ps.-Xenophon as well as Aristotle and, almost, Thucydides' Epitaphios, together as one species of literature by contrast with Atthides as another. Strangest of all perhaps is Jacoby's treatment of *Ἀθπ.* 29. 2, Pythodorus' motion, and Clitophon's amendment to it, preliminary to the setting-up of the Four Hundred: 'the line of thought of Pythodorus is purely political', to meet the present needs of the State; he did not 'think historically' and so did not propose an investigation into the laws of Solon. Whyever should he? Clitophon did propose to investigate those of Cleisthenes; therefore, says Jacoby, no records of Solon's *boule* existed; and the reason for the amendment, ὡς οὐ δημοτικὴν ἀλλὰ παραπλησίαν οὖσαν τὴν Κλ. πολιτείαν τῇ Σόλωνος, does not represent the thoughts of men at the time but is Androtion's view, which Aristotle just wrote down though it contradicts his own (22. 1).

I must not be led into a discussion of matters raised in the many digressions; but here is one. Jacoby objects to my view (*Ath. Studies presented to W. S. Ferguson*, 243–4) that in one respect the history of Athens in the fifth and fourth

centuries can be usefully compared with that of Great Britain since 1832, in that no class of the community was driven, or withdrew, from political life owing to democratic reform; if, he says, 'in this country "all are agreed that parliamentary government must be carried on", the opposition has at all times the prospect of coming into office by a general election; this was possible in Athens only by a revolution or by armed assistance from outside'. Was then Antiphon the only 'conservative' in Athens? What of the son of Melesias, Nicias, and Theramenes? or Androtion?

But for all my disagreement with so much in this book, I must repeat that it is one to be read and studied. Now that our debt to Jacoby is increased by the appearance of III B of *F.Gr.Hist.*, which contains the *Atthidographi*, we have the sources, though not yet his commentary, to which he often refers. The book is very well printed and produced, and the proof correcting accurately done; I noticed but few misprints—five in Greek (pp. 32, 187, 257, 264, 369), a spate of misspellings of Schachermeyr's name (pp. 368–70, 377–9), and, the only serious one, an apparently misplaced sentence in parenthesis on p. 208. We are grateful to all concerned.

University of Glasgow

A. W. GOMME

PLATO

R. S. BLUCK: *Plato's Life and Thought*. With a translation of the Seventh Letter. Pp. 200. London: Routledge, 1949. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

ANY serious account of Plato's thought in these days is bound to be polemical, however humane the intention of the writer may be. We find Plato's metaphysics regarded as nonsense (first in the technical meaning of the word and then, by an illegitimate extension, in its ordinary meaning) and as a camouflage of dangerous political teaching. This onslaught, when not simply proceeding *à parti pris*, arises from an original mistaken view of Plato as an Hegelian or as a Christian who fails to show a concern for individual rights which some Christians have not shown. Scholars ought therefore to make the facts available as a basis of judgement, and the question of the historical Plato becomes more important than that of the historical Socrates. Fortunately our evidence in Plato's case is less conjectural, and general acceptance of the Seventh and Eighth Letters has increased and focused it. This interpretation of Plato in his historical context has always been notably forwarded by Professor G. C. Field (who has recently written an excellent Home University Library book, *The Philosophy of Plato*) and his work now receives support from Mr. Bluck's recent edition of Letters vii and viii (reviewed in *C.R.* lxii. 130) and from the present work.

After a few introductory pages Mr. Bluck gives about a quarter of the book to an account of Plato's life and then a half of it to a summary of the dialogues. He concludes with a translation of the Seventh Letter. He says that he intends the work to be a summary for students of Plato and an introduction for students of philosophy with no Greek. It should serve both these ends, and it could well be introduced in the sixth form to the historians as well as to those with philosophical or classical interests. There is perhaps too much detail concerning Syracusan factions and too little on fourth-century politics generally. The

political ideal of Isocrates receives only one vague mention. However, the principle that we must judge Plato by his known deeds and his expressed thoughts is sound, and the over-elaboration of Sicilian matters is a fault on the right side.

Mr. Bluck singles out Demosthenes for mention among 'the Athenians educated at the Academy' (p. 32), but this is surely misleading. Diogenes Laertius iii. 47 shows the poverty of the evidence; so does Plutarch (*Vit. Dem.* 5), who tells us that Hermippus had the tradition from an unknown source. Naturally Demosthenes must be made to 'hear' Plato, just as Isocrates had 'heard' Socrates. The point is significant, because it is a very tragic fact that the Academy gave almost nothing to Athens herself—perhaps only Lycurgus a generation later. One is surprised, on the other hand, not to find Erastus and Coriscus mentioned among the philosophers who advised kings, for Mr. Bluck presumably accepts the Sixth Letter.

The summary of the dialogues is lucid and well proportioned. In particular, it gives the *Republic* no more than its rightful place and so avoids a mistake common among beginners but not confined to them. In a review it is impossible to keep a like balance between praise and cavil and I must confine myself to cavil. The summing-up of the *Cratylus* (p. 66) is not altogether happy. According to Plato names are not, or ought not to be, 'merely matters of convention'. They should not exist νόμῳ καὶ εἶθι in the popular sense but should be made by the νομοθέτης advised by the διαλεκτικός. The *Phaedrus* is seen too exclusively as an attack on Isocrates. At any rate Plato criticizes him by his own method and makes Socrates produce a 'fair copy' of a speech; and this leads to a very important statement concerning the nature of the real art of rhetoric. Mr. Bluck dates the pamphlet of Polycrates as late as 388 and so puts the *Gorgias* and *Phaedo* as well as the *Symposium* after Plato's return from Sicily. (Presumably the *Busiris* of Isocrates must also be after 388 on this dating.) This is hard to accept for many reasons, especially if one doubts the earlier journeys to Egypt and Cyrene which Mr. Bluck accepts. It seems much more likely that after the end of military duties in 391, when there was no Academy to occupy him as yet but Isocrates' new school challenged his thought, Plato wrote intensively and went beyond the shorter 'Socratic' dialogues he had written before. He could learn all the Pythagoreanism of the *Phaedo* and *Gorgias* from refugee Pythagoreans on the mainland, and the shift of emphasis from individual to community in the *Republic* may well reflect experience of Syracuse and Tarentum.

On two matters I think Mr. Bluck errs by taking Plato rather too literally. He says of Socrates: 'We do not even know that he believed in the gods in any truly religious sense, and on the question of the immortality of the soul he held that knowledge was impossible' (p. 60). He naturally finds conflict between agnosticism in the *Apology* and assurance in the *Phaedo*. Accepting Plato as evidence, may we not claim that Socrates believed in the gods in a deeper way than his accusers did (*Apol.* 35 d)? As for the agnosticism, it can be so called only in a refined sense. Annihilation is admitted as possible, but the anticipation is of juster judges and happier encounters. The preponderance of the latter alternative is the preponderance of what follows καὶ in such phrases as ἀλλὰ τε καὶ. There is no real antagonism with the 'Bury me if you can catch me' of the *Phaedo*, because logical demonstration is not claimed there either.

The second literalism of Mr. Bluck is on a question fundamental to Platonic studies. We are told that 'we must regard the composition of the dialogues . . .

as a spare-time hobby to which the writer attached very little importance' (p. 33: there is more to the same effect on p. 114 where the *Phaedrus* passage which disparages written compositions is discussed). Is it not rather the case that Plato's conscience troubled him in this respect? He knew that on Socratic principles discourses were best, but he could not resist the temptation to write this kind of literary *aide-mémoire*. We, of course, cannot share in Academy discussions, but have we been left with mere *πάρεργα*? Surely not, even if Plato says so; and if we look carefully at the passages in which he says so, there are special reasons in each case. Post suggests them in the case of *Ep.* ii 314 c in his note *ad loc.* In *Ep.* vii (cited by Mr. Bluck) Plato is disowning an abridgement of his philosophy written by Dionysius of all people, and objecting to such treatment in general. Perhaps, as Cherniss suggests in *The Riddle of the Early Academy*, formal instruction in the Academy was in mathematics only and metaphysical questions were left to open discussion; but if so, did not Plato come to despair of the High Table of the Academy as a place of Socratic discussion and turn to write the 'critical dialogues' as we call them? At any rate the *Timaeus* is no pastime (*pace* Taylor) and the *Laws* reveals the grim effort of an old man. So Mr. Bluck was right after all in devoting half his book to an *exposé* of the dialogues and calling it a study of Plato's thought.

The translation of the Seventh Letter is good and clear. Mr. Bluck now renders *εὖ πεφυκότος* at 343 e 'sound' and, with Post, accepts *ἀπεμφαίνοντα* as original at 347 b. He still believes the parenthesis at 337 c *init.* to be an interpolation. But parentheses need not be interpolated, and *Politicus* 292 e is similar but not too similar to this passage. 'Pardoned' is wrongly spelt on p. 49; at least one more comma is needed at p. 68, line 12, and the footnote reference on p. 95 should be 95, not 93.

University of Durham

J. B. SKEMP

THE CORN OF CLEANTHES

G. VERBEKE, *Kleanthes van Assos*. (Verhandelingen van de Kon. Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Klasse der Letteren, XI. 9.) Pp. 260. Brussels: R. Flemish Academy, 1949. Paper.

No separate study of Cleanthes has been written since his fragments have been collected, and for reasons which are not hard to find. His fragments are comparatively few and uninformative; and the points of difference recorded between him and Zeno or Chrysippus do not seem to go very deep. We are told that he gave a cruder account of sensation than Chrysippus: external objects literally stamp their own impressions on the material soul. It is said by Stobaeus (but Diogenes Laertius does not agree) that after Zeno had defined virtue as 'living consistently', Cleanthes added the words 'with nature'. It is also said that he made universal nature the standard of morality, refusing to include the nature of particular beings; on this point Chrysippus disagreed. Cleanthes differed from Chrysippus also in thinking that virtue once acquired could not be lost. Among the virtues Zeno regarded wisdom as chief; Cleanthes in more Cynical vein gave first place to 'strength' or self-control. He also thought that all souls (and not merely the wise, as Chrysippus held) survive until the *ἐκπύρωσις*. He is the only Stoic who figures in Aetius' highly dubious list, which

excludes Aristotle, of philosophers who held that mind enters 'from without' (*ὑπαθεν*). On this insecure basis Verbeke thinks that Cleanthes, under the influence of Plato, asserted the pre-existence of the rational part of the soul.

It would be natural to expect the author of a book with this title to begin with the fragments and testimonia, to show clearly how much of the Stoic philosophy, as taught by Zeno or Chrysippus or simply 'the Stoics' (since the authorities incline to bracket them all together), is implied in them, and then, in the light of such indications as the above, to seek to isolate Cleanthes' personal contribution to, or disagreement with, the system as a whole. From this point of view the present work must be pronounced a disappointment. More than a third of it consists of introductory matter, a survey, on the usual lines, of the philosophers and philosophies of the third century B.C., and a discussion of the life and writings of Cleanthes. The remainder of the book contains far more about the Stoics in general than about Cleanthes in particular; and its leisurely treatment of Stoic ethics, psychology, cosmology, and theology admits of numerous excursions into Platonism, Aristotelianism, Epicureanism, and Scepticism. Not that Cleanthes is forgotten; V. uses such formulae as 'Cleanthes, like the Stoics in general'. And in the all-too-rare passages where he does seek to come to grips with his subject he makes heroic attempts to expand the evidence. For example, Chalcidius credits 'Zeno and Chrysippus' with a belief in something resembling 'secondary matter'; the omission of Cleanthes' name is taken to mean that he did not share this belief. Similarly in D.L. vii. 131 'Zeno and Chrysippus' are said to have advocated community of wives; a stricter 'marriage-morality' is attributed to Cleanthes merely because his name is here omitted. Such an argument should not have been used without an examination of the other passages where Zeno and Chrysippus are mentioned and Cleanthes ignored. Its unsoundness is demonstrated by, for example, D.L. vii. 127: 'Zeno and Chrysippus' believed virtue all-sufficient for happiness; it by no means follows that Cleanthes took a different view. One might as well argue from Persius' reference (v. 64) to 'the corn of Cleanthes' that Zeno and Chrysippus had none.

Such arguments add up to a very novel account of Cleanthes' philosophy. (1) No fragment associates Cleanthes with Zeno's doctrine of the *καθῆκον*; therefore D.L. vii. 127, on the absence of any intermediate state between virtue and vice, must refer to Cleanthes alone, though it certainly does not look like it. He is therefore called the most uncompromising representative of the 'ethical radicalism' of the Stoa. (2) His emphasis on self-control 'proves' (after E. Bréhier) that his ethics were rather voluntarist, as compared with Zeno's intellectualism. This by no means follows; besides, Cleanthes believed virtue to be teachable, and in the *Hymn to Zeus* (which V. in an appendix treats very pedantically as a technical philosophic document) the prayer is not for strength but for wisdom and the removal of ignorance. (3) The voluntarism is attributed to a dualistic psychology; Cleanthes is alleged to have followed Plato in sharply opposing the rational and the irrational elements in the soul. (4) His cosmology is also pronounced to be dualistic: matter is not fully obedient to the divine pneuma (it *is*, in the *Hymn*—*ἐκὼν κρατεῖται*); it can, and does, *resist*; hence apparently it is not generated by the divine fire, and not fully permeated by it. Yet Cleanthes clearly held the doctrine of the One Cause, and himself describes the differentiation of the seed-like fire-god into the parts which pass back into fire again when the time comes (von Arnim, i. 497, etc.).

That, as V. contends, the god of Cleanthes—and of the other Stoics—sometimes seems to be transcendent, and their pantheism more like 'panentheism', simply means that their pantheism was not consistent. And if their inconsistencies are the most fruitful parts of their doctrine, nevertheless it is the monism which is fundamental, not the divergencies from it. In spite of the alleged dualism V. himself goes on talking of Cleanthes' materialistic monism, and his view that the universe is an organism with a material soul and material bodily parts; and seems to insist on a breakdown of determinism only in regard to the inner attitude of the individual human soul. I should add that V. also seems to me to fail in his attempt to prove Cleanthes' indebtedness to Aristotle's *de philosophia* both for his materialism (especially in psychology) and for one of his arguments (the Platonic argument from the 'grades of being') for the existence of God.

University of Sheffield

J. TATE

THE LETTERS OF ALCIPHRON, AELIAN, AND PHILOSTRATUS

The Letters of Alciphron, Aelian, and Philostratus. With an English translation by ALLEN ROGERS BENNER and FRANCIS H. FOBES. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xi+588. London: Heinemann (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press), 1949. Cloth, 15s. net.

PROFESSOR FOBES has completed the preparation of this volume which Professor Benner left unfinished at the time of his death in 1940. Together they have produced a careful, accurate, and scholarly work. In the case of each author the account of the manuscripts is clear and well arranged, and corrects a number of mistakes in previous editions. In preparing their text of Alciphron the editors worked on Schepers's editions, helped by the results of Castiglioni's collations, but they have gone considerably farther than Schepers in preserving the manuscript readings. Caution in emending the text of a highly artificial writer like Alciphron is necessary, but the editors appear at times to have been unduly conservative. This conservatism has led them to retain in their text a number of questionable constructions; e.g. 2. 28. 2 *τίς* . . . *ἐπιτήδειος ἢ σὺ* ('who is better suited than you?'), 3. 28. 4 *ἦν* with the optative (not found elsewhere in Alciphron according to Schepers), 3. 34. 1 *ξένης ἢ κατὰ* ('quite above the level of'). In some places, where it is difficult to get the required sense from the manuscript readings, attractive emendations have been rejected; e.g. Reiske's *γενοῦ* for *ἐγγύς* at 2. 13. 3 and Hemsterhuys's *κόμματος* for *σκέμματος* at 3. 5. 3. At 2. 17. 1, where *καταγαγόντα* is made to mean 'put the donkey up', neither sense nor grammar is satisfactory. Some thirty-five new emendations are found in the apparatus, of which rather more than half appear in the text; many of these involve very small changes. The apparatus gives most of the important manuscript readings; some earlier emendations, however, for which a good case might be made are not mentioned.

The text of Aelian's *Letters* is a great improvement on Hercher's. It is the first to take note of the only two existing manuscripts which were inaccessible to Hercher, who based his text on the Aldine edition, itself based on the fifteenth-century Matritensis (or a manuscript closely akin to this); the tenth-century

Ambrosianus was apparently unknown to the editor. Five new emendations are introduced for which Post is mainly responsible. His *λύτταν* in 13 for the manuscript variants *λύπην* and *λήθην* is particularly convincing. The text of Philostratus' *Letters* raises peculiarly complicated problems. Working on Kayser's confusing apparatus, the editors have done their best to make their own simple and orderly, but, as they say, recollection of the manuscripts is badly needed. No new emendations of any note are made in the text but a few, mainly by Capps, are included in the apparatus.

The translation is readable, faithful, and nearly always accurate. Of the passages where its accuracy could be questioned the following may be mentioned: Alciphr. 2. 10. 2 *ρύμη κατασπύρμενοι ἰλὸν ἐπεσπάσαντο* means 'rushing furiously down drew mud after them' rather than 'swept up silt and drew it along', Ael. 17 *ᾠραν . . . τίθεται* should be 'pays heed to' rather than 'looks out for', Philostr. 28 *ὅσω καὶ τοῦ φρονεῖν ἐγγύτερός ἐστιν* means 'in proportion to the amount of good sense he has' rather than 'in proportion to his inclination to be conceited'. Philostr. 36 *ad fin. ὡς μέλλουσά τι καὶ τῇ γῇ χαρίζεσθαι* cannot mean 'as one who is destined to include even earth in her beauty'; perhaps 'beauty' is a misprint for 'bounty'. In one or two places the readings of text and translation appear to differ: e.g. Alciphr. 3. 26. 3, where the text follows the manuscripts in reading *βιάζεσθαι*, the translation 'submit to anything' suggests Herwerden's conjecture *πάσχειν* (not given in the apparatus), as does the passage in Demosthenes to which reference is made in the footnotes; Alciphr. 4. 5. 2 'you seem to have decided' suggests Vind.'s *βεβουλευσθαι* (not in apparatus) rather than the text's *βεβουλῆσθαι*; Philostr. 18, where the text has *ἐν τούτοις . . . τοῖς ἐρύμασιν*, the translation 'in such protective garb' suggests Capps's *τοιούτοις*. It would, however, be misleading to mention these points without paying tribute to the excellence of the translation as a whole.

The footnotes are apt, concise, and often very interesting. In preparing them Professor Fobes must have covered a wide range of literature. They generally give exactly what the reader wants to know and add greatly to his enjoyment.

The three introductions, without attempting to give new or original ideas, provide a useful summary of theories held by other scholars. Different views on Alciphron's date are discussed, and in this connexion the case for and against his supposed imitation of other writers is summarized. There is a brief conspectus of evidence relating to the question: 'How many Philostrati were there, and which of them wrote what?'; the authenticity of the *Letters* is then considered and it is concluded that for want of proof to the contrary they must be thought genuine, i.e. the work of Philostratus II. One would have liked fuller treatment of the literary nature and value of the letters generally; reference is, however, made to works dealing with this aspect.

There is a sound and extensive bibliography on each author. The whole volume is well indexed, including the more significant points in variant readings. Printing and proof-reading appear to have been excellent throughout; the only misprints noticed in the Greek were unimportant.

Modern readers will probably have little patience with Philostratus' extravagances and repetitions, but Alciphron, for all his artificiality, has an irresistible sparkle and gaiety, particularly in the letters of his parasites and prostitutes. This edition greatly adds to the ease and enjoyment with which these letters may be read.

King's College, Newcastle upon Tyne

H. LL. HUDSON-WILLIAMS

THE TEUBNER CICERO

M. Tulli Ciceronis *scripta quae manserunt omnia*. Fasc. 8. *Oratio pro Sex. Roscio Amerino*: iterum recognovit A. KLOTZ. Pp. viii+63. Fasc. 13. *In C. Verrem Actionis Secundae Libri IV-V*: iterum recognovit A. KLOTZ. Pp. 178. Fasc. 19. *Oratio pro P. Sulla*: iterum recognovit H. KASTEN; *Oratio pro Archia poeta*: iterum recognovit P. REIS. Pp. x+62. Leipzig: Teubner, 1949. Fasc. 8, paper, \$0.90, Fasc. 13, cloth, \$2.15, and Fasc. 19, paper, \$1.

CLASSICAL scholars in this country will welcome the reappearance of Teubner texts and will recognize in these editions of Cicero, which replace earlier ones by the same editors, a careful and scholarly piece of work.

Klotz's text of the *pro Sex. Roscio* contains a number of changes from his 1922 edition. His revised readings: 3 *ego autem si*, 38 *te*, *C. Eruci*, 80 *perfundere*, and 134 *conviviis* (all accepted earlier by Clark) rightly follow the best manuscript tradition. Wisely too Kl. accepts at 107 the reading to which the manuscripts seem to point: *indiciuae partem* ('a share of the reward for an informer' cf. *indican* 105). His conservatism, however, is at times regrettable, e.g. 106 *nihil est quod suspitione hoc putetis* (*suspicionem hoc p. codd.*). More drastic measures are called for here; but few of the proposed emendations give a satisfactory construction for the ablative which they include. Madvig's *suspitione occupetis* is still the most likely solution. In adopting Martin's conjecture *omnes eos* (90) (*Mammeos codd.*) Kl. rightly turns his back on prosopographical speculation. Is it possible that *omnes* in the previous line is a misplaced correction? Kl.'s acceptance of a form *etquis* (46 and 92) is puzzling, especially as he prints *ecquid* at 104 (where Clark's apparatus gives *etquid* A); and his omission of *bonorum emptores* after *isti* (151) is unexplained. His apparatus, which is more than usually generous throughout, contains a bad misprint on 106 (p. 41. 19), where for *continere* read *contineri*.

Fasc. 13 replaces part of the same scholar's 1923 edition of the *Verrines*, but does not greatly differ from its predecessor.

Klotz now rightly accepts *actae commemorabantur* 5. 94 (a reading of R. Klotz, though Kl.'s note only mentions Philippson), and *Theoplactum* 4. 148, proposed by Wackernagel and Maas. Other recent work on the *Verrines*, in particular that of Sydow and Walter, is occasionally noted in Kl.'s apparatus, without influencing his text, though Sydow's emendation *ac atrocitate* 5. 108 would have been an improvement. Sydow's correction *hanc habuit unam sententiam* 4. 138 deserved mention: *primo*, as Richter saw, is out of place here, and can hardly mean 'chiefly', as translators have sometimes understood it. At 5. 165, where Kl. obelizes the manuscript reading *tuis proximis*, it would be better to read *testibus* [*proximis*], treating *proximis* as a gloss on *testibus* (cf. 164 *producam . . . municipes illius ac necessarios*). In now adopting at 4. 46, 4. 57, 4. 105, 5. 29, 5. 56, and 5. 93 readings of the β group of manuscripts (the *familia Italica* of Madvig) against those of the α (or Gallic) family, Kl. carries further a tendency already evident in his previous edition.

Perhaps a more careful revision would have removed some of the many inconsistencies in spelling, e.g. *Tundaritari* 4. 29 (elsewhere *Tyndaritari*), *Rhegini* 4. 135 (elsewhere *Regini*), *Carthago* 5. 125 and index (elsewhere *Karthago*), *exspecto* 5. 161 (elsewhere *expecto*), and even where there is some manu-

script support for different forms, e.g. *cognoverant* and *cognorant*, *remisse* and *dimisisse*, *relicuus* and *reliquus*, *possimus* (indicative) and *possumus*, *effringo* and *effringo*, Kl. would have done better to print one form of each word throughout.

Misprints occur on p. 354, l. 24 app.; p. 364, l. 25; p. 399, l. 5; p. 402, l. 7; p. 421, l. 2; p. 444, l. 17; p. 456, l. 14, and p. 507, l. 6. Among the references in the Index to pages in this volume, under *L. Curidius*, *L. Papinius*, and *L. Papirius Potamo* for 371 read 374; under *M. Marius* for 441 read 444; and under *Pompei Percennii* delete 376. 13. The large number of minor inaccuracies in addition to these—I counted forty in the references to the new pages—strengthens the impression that this volume might have been much better had a little more care been taken with proof-reading.

Kasten makes few changes in the *pro Sulla*. He now accepts Sydow's emendation *de supplicio <sumpto> de Lentulo* (30) and mentions Sydow's *quorum ego luminum* (5). The latter is an easy change from *quorum ego illum*, and is to be preferred to K.'s *quorum ego <exemplo> illum*, which does not resolve the difficulty of the false contrast *illum locum . . . hanc sedem*. A number of differences between K. and Clark in the early part of the speech result from K.'s preference for the Vaticanus (V), especially on points of word-order, since it appears from several passages, where the Tegernseensis (T) is alone in its reading, that T's scribe sometimes altered the order. This does not, however, warrant our following V's order, as K. seems at times to assume (cf. 6 in *ceteris causis*, 31 *facis eius modi*), where all the inferior manuscripts support T.

Reis too, while printing the same text of the *pro Archia* as before, mentions the work done in recent years by Sydow. The latter's *viribus* (23) inspires as little confidence as R.'s *eminus*, and Madvig's deletion of *minus* should be accepted. R.'s frequent and unnecessary insertion of (*sic!*) when quoting some of the scholiast's aberrations is the least commendable feature of his apparatus.

The texts, which include useful testimonia and indices, are well printed on a larger size of page than the old Teubners, and are so much the easier to read.

University College, Cardiff

J. H. SIMON

SYMBOLA COLONIENSIA

Symbola Coloniensia Iosepho Kroll Sexagenario a.d. vi Id. Nov. a. MCMIL oblata. Pp. vi+172. Cologne: Pick, 1949. Paper, DM. 14.00.

THE subjects dealt with in this *Festschrift* are so various as to give a most impressive idea of the intellectual interests of the scholar in whose honour it has been prepared; but this variety is a deep embarrassment to the present reviewer, who may perhaps be allowed to adapt some rather rueful words used by one of the contributors (p. 162, n. 64) and admit that the subjects dealt with in most of the essays 'entziehen sich dem Bereich meiner Kompetenz'. This notice must therefore take the form rather of a summary of contents than of a properly critical review.

Over one-third of the book (pp. 1-70) is occupied by an essay on 'Homerische Einzellieder' by Gunther Jachmann. This is a discussion of Hector's visit to Troy and its surroundings (*Iliad* iii-viii) in the strongly separatist tradition of Wilamowitz, Bethe, and Schwartz, and with outspoken homage to Wilamowitz.

Although Professor Jachmann often criticizes Wilamowitz and other separatists, all the familiar abuse of the composer of the *Iliad*—'Flickpoet', 'Plumpheit und Seelenlosigkeit', 'Lässigkeit des Redaktors', and so on—appears; and those who cannot accept the suppressed premiss of the separatist enthymeme ('great poets are never guilty of anything which a modern critic could possibly regard as a mistake') are accused of taking up a 'Kinderstandpunkt' and of 'Akrisie' when they try to defend the artistic unity of the *Iliad*. Many of Professor Jachmann's criticisms of details are perhaps justified, and it would indeed be childish for any 'unitarian' to overlook them; but it is clear that Professor Jachmann has never given serious consideration to the strength of the case which old-fashioned separatists have now to meet—the only works not in German to which he refers are those of Payne Knight, G. M. Bolling, and P. Chantraine (in the Budé *Introduction à l'Illiade*), a fact which is in itself significant of the complete one-sidedness of his attitude to the problems which he discusses.

Tobias Dohrn, 'Phidias, Perikles und Athen' (71-83), considers ancient and modern views of Phidias as an artist, and the relation of his work to the political aims of Pericles. Following Buschor ('Pferde des Phidias'), he gives great weight to Phidias' representations of horses and horsemen and to the worship of Athena as a goddess of horses. He connects the horsemen on the Parthenon frieze with the reorganization of the Athenian citizen-cavalry, which inscriptions show to have taken place before 446. Here he seems to me to be on somewhat insecure ground, but his passing suggestion that the reorganization itself is to be dated somewhere near 457 is probably right (in my opinion it should be regarded as one of the measures taken by Athens after Tanagra, i.e. in the off-season 458-457).

Andreas Rumpf, 'Tettix' (85-99), is a masterly, and to my mind absolutely conclusive, discussion of the precise nature of the cicada-ornament which, according to Thucydides (i. 6), Athenians had until quite recently worn in their hair. Professor Rumpf refers to a long series of vase-paintings and other representations (almost all Attic of the first half of the fifth century) in which the hair is held in place by a band secured at the front by a metal plate or brooch (the best-known example is perhaps the Artemis in the Pan painter's 'Death of Actaeon') and suggests that this fastening is the *tettix* or *tettiges*; he notes that gold brooches in the form of a cicada are already known from Ephesus, Thermon, and Attica.

Wolfgang Schmid, 'Lukrez über die Mächtigen und ihre Angst' (86-109), discusses primarily the *crux* in Lucr. ii. 40-4, and proposes that in 43 *structas* should be read for the *ilast(at)uas* of the primary manuscripts. He goes on to suggest that the present state of the passage is due to the conflation of two recensions (A with 43a but without 41, and B with only 40, 41, 44, and 45). He ends by discussing two other cases of repeated lines in Lucretius (v. 1327-8, 1359-60).

Lothar Wickert, 'Der Prinzipat und die Freiheit' (111-41), considers the concept of 'Libertas' under the empire, both in its official and semi-official meanings (when it appears in inscriptions, on coins, and in panegyrics) and in its interpretations by the various levels of public opinion. This leads him to a reconsideration of the *Res Gestae* as a peculiarly individual expression of Augustus' *Selbstbewusstsein*, and so to the use of personal and possessive pronouns by, and in references to, the emperors.

Ulrich Knoche, 'Ein Sinnbild römischer Selbstauffassung' (143-62, with a reproduction of the reverse of a coin of Postumus—Cologne mint, 263—showing ROMA seated), deals especially with the *Laudes Romae* in Rutilius Namatianus (i. 47-164) and argues that, though the whole passage is deeply coloured by rhetorical and literary conventions, Rutilius should still be regarded as essentially a defender of the old Roman traditions and culture (in the manner of the younger Symmachus) against the ideas of the modern age and especially of the Christians.

Fritz Schalk, 'L. B. Albertis Buch "De Amicitia" (Della Famiglia IV)' (163-71), considers the works of the fifteenth-century Italian humanists on the duty of man towards his family, friends, and society, and especially Alberti's *De Amicitia*, both in relation to their Classical forerunners (especially Xenophon, the *Nicomachean Ethics*, the pseudo-Aristotelian *Oeconomica*, and Plutarch's *Moralia*) and as an important chapter in the development of the humanist idea of education.

The book has no index and is carelessly printed, especially in the earlier essays where Greek is frequently quoted. One may also regret the absence of any notes on the life or work of the scholar here honoured by his colleagues and pupils.

University of Manchester

J. A. DAVISON

SELF-PORTRAYAL IN ANTIQUITY

GEORG MISCH: *Geschichte der Autobiographie*. Erster Band: Das Altertum (Erste Hälfte). 3rd edition. Pp. xiii+354. Bern: Francke, 1949. Paper, 15.50 (Cloth, 19.50) Sw. fr.

THE first edition of this work appeared nearly fifty years ago. When a second edition was issued in 1931, considerations of economy severely limited the German publishers in making alterations and additions which, in the author's opinion, had become desirable. Volume i of that edition ran to 472 pages; the present book, which is only the first Part of volume i, contains 354. Switzerland has, therefore, given us a considerably enlarged edition, and a sumptuous, finely printed volume. While gaps in the subject-matter of the previous editions have received attention, much of the increase is accounted for by greater richness of illustration and quotation. This is an important improvement, since the subject is one for the general reader (as well as for specialists of various kinds), who should be enabled to read and reflect uninterruptedly with a reasonable amount of documentation within immediate reach.

The subject of the book is not merely autobiography as a literary genre. It deals in a general way with the development of self-realization, self-examination, and self-portrayal in antiquity, and the reflection of these processes both in autobiographical literature and in prose and verse writings not specifically autobiographical in form or intention. The treatment of the subject shows a discreet combination of the historical and the philosophical approach. The central influences of *Selbstanschauung* and *Selbstdarstellung* are traced throughout the literature which in whole or in part comes within the category of autobiographical writing.

After a preliminary discussion on philosophical lines, the author turns to the ancient East—Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Palestine; but it is in post-Homeric Greece that the growing realization of individuality, which leads to genuine autobiography in the author's extended sense, is found. Hesiod, Archilochus, Solon, Empedocles, and Heraclitus are discussed in relation to this development. The following chapter deals with the Attic age, special attention being paid to the influence of Socrates, to Plato's Seventh Epistle, and to Isocrates.

The second part of the volume deals with the Hellenistic and Roman worlds, extending, with its discussion of Galen, into the second century A.D. This part is divided into two chapters, the first of which is entitled *Die Autobiographie im politischen Leben*, the second *Die Schriftsteller-Autobiographie und die Charakter-Analyse*. The first of these chapters deals mainly with Rome, tracing the autobiographical tendency in the Republic, as manifested in inscriptions, family records, and political pamphlets, as well as in works of literature. Among the last, Caesar's *Commentaries* and the political-autobiographical parts of Cicero's works are examined, and the *Res Gestae* of Augustus is discussed in considerable detail.

The final chapter proceeds from an examination of the views and influence of Aristotle to consideration of self-revelation in such authors as Callimachus, Propertius, and Ovid, and to Josephus and Nicolaus of Damascus as authors of autobiographies in the strict sense of the word. The volume concludes with a discussion of Galen and of Cicero's *Brutus* under the heading of *Schriften- und Bildungsgeschichte*.

There is now little need to commend a work which long ago won the approval of Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, and which time has enlarged and enriched. It is greatly to be hoped that the second Part of volume i, which will bring the work down to Boethius, will not be long delayed. It appears that the present edition owes its origin to a project for an edition in English formed during the author's residence in this country. This edition will be eagerly awaited;¹ for the work is one which should be available in English. It has a philosophical and human interest that should appeal to a wider public than that which nowadays equips itself with a reading knowledge of German; and if the necessity of catering for the more delicate British digestion resulted in easier readability, then the subject on which Professor Misch has worked so long and so well might benefit both here and abroad.

King's College, London

W. S. MAGUINNESS

¹ The English translation was published by Routledge and Kegan Paul in 1950.

ATTIC INSCRIPTIONS

Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum. Vol. X. Adiuvantibus G. KLAFFENBACH, M. N. TOD, redigendum curaverunt J. J. E. HONDIIUS, A. E. RAUBITSCHKE. Pp. 176. Leiden: Sijthoff, 1949. Paper.

WHEN Dr. Hondius inaugurated *S.E.G.* in 1923 it was intended to publish annually the epigraphic work of the past year in much the same way as *L'Année épigraphique* provides for Latin epigraphy. The pace of discovery and discussion soon caused a change in plan. *S.E.G.* v. set the useful precedent of

confining volumes to work in a limited field over a period of years. This has proved a most welcome change: with comprehensive reviews we are well provided in the excellent summaries of Tod and Robert.

This latest volume of *S.E.G.* is limited to Attic inscriptions down to the archonship of Euclides, and excludes dedications on the Acropolis, published by Raubitschek in *Dedications on the Acropolis*, and ostraka and vase inscriptions, which will both be published independently. With these exceptions *S.E.G.* x is in fact a revision of *I.G.* i²; it bears eloquent witness to the progress of Greek epigraphy in this field during the twenty-five years since Hiller von Gaertringen produced his invaluable texts. Of 467 inscriptions included in this volume some 80 have been found since Hiller's publication, mainly in the excavations of the Agora. Of the texts in *I.G.* i² there are few that have not been improved by new fragments, new readings, or new restorations. It is of inestimable value to have this mass of material, scattered over so many periodicals and books, assembled in a single volume. The bibliographies attached to each inscription will save historians a great deal of time; the epigraphist will particularly welcome the references to photographs.

The length of the bibliographies that have accumulated round old inscriptions is interesting. The Salamis decree (*I.G.* i². 1) has attracted continuous attention and will sustain continued controversy. In others, such as the building accounts and treasurers' accounts, progress continues in a more steady line. But some inscriptions have attracted surprisingly little attention. We note, for examples, the Histiaeae decrees, for which Hiller's texts are most unsatisfactory, and which badly need revision and disentanglement, and the Samian decree of 412 (*I.G.* i². 101 = *S.E.G.* x. 113), which deserves more attention than it has received. Of the few inscriptions from *I.G.* i². that have been passed over in these years, *I.G.* i². 73, 79, 93 should not be permanently lost to sight.

Dr. Hondius in this volume maintains the standard of scholarly precision that we have come to expect from him. With him is associated in the editorship A. E. Raubitschek, whose own contribution to the study of these inscriptions is already considerable. We are greatly in their debt, for this work of collation, though it carries its own compensation, has perhaps less of the excitement that comes from original work, and is more laborious. The volume includes photographs of three distinguished epigraphists who have recently died—Hiller von Gaertringen, P. Roussel, E. Ziebarth. A glance at these photographs confirms the aptness of the brief tribute paid to each by Dr. Hondius in his Preface.

A few minor points may be added. The printing of the accounts for the Samian revolt (*S.E.G.* x. 221) does not perhaps make it sufficiently clear that the small fragment printed at the end is broken on all sides and unplaced. In *S.E.G.* x. 226, the treasurers' accounts for an early year in the Peloponnesian War, Meritt's restorations are printed and they apply to 431-430, but the title date is 428/7 (though Hondius in a note indicates the discrepancy). Meritt's date for the altar of Pisistratus (*c.* 497/6) is accepted (318), though the balance of argument has strengthened an earlier dating. *S.E.G.* x. 76 should, we think, carry a query in its title. Meritt attributed it to a decree concerning Chios of 425/4, on the strength of Thucydides iv. 51 and the name Cleonymus; but καὶ ἄτερ Χίω[ν τοῖς ἥκοσι . . . in l. 10 might suggest that the decree did not concern Chios. To the bibliography of *S.E.G.* x. 132 (Selymbria) should be added R. J. Hopper, *J.H.S.* lxiii (1943), 47 f.

This volume was completed before the publication of *A.T.L.* ii. Some of the

new texts (such as the Erythrae decree) from that volume have been included but in others substantial changes have been made, especially in *A* 25 (Coinage Decree), 39 (Samos), 69 (Lesbos), 75 (tribute decree of 425).

In this volume, as in others, Dr. Hondius has been assisted by Tod, Meritt, Wilhelm, and other leading epigraphists. *S.E.G.* has remained a striking example of international scholarship. But the main burden has been carried by Dr. Hondius himself who, even throughout the war, had the courage and faith to continue his work for the scholars of all nations.¹

Balliol College, Oxford

RUSSELL MEIGGS

¹ This review was already in print when news of Dr. Hondius' sudden death was received.

ANCIENT SPARTA

K. M. T. CHRIMES: *Ancient Sparta, a Re-examination of the Evidence*. Pp. xv+527; 9 plates, 1 map. Manchester: University Press, 1949. Cloth, 45s. net.

THIS book attempts to explain Spartan institutions by working backwards from the fairly full evidence now available for certain aspects of Spartan life under the early Empire. The results are frequently novel and disconcerting. Thus C. believes that the *agoge* was an inheritance from a feudal past; that the ephors were descended from the Homeric *κῆρυκες*, and originally assistants to a single king and three (unfortunately unattested) *phylobasileis*; and that the institution of the dual monarchy was part of Lycurgus' reforms, which converted Sparta from a feudal into a united State. The book is in two halves; in the first C. surveys the Hellenistic and Roman evidence, in the second she applies the information this survey has given her to tackle the formidable problems presented by early Sparta—the social and military organization, the status of the helots and perioeci, and the date and character of the Lyncurgan reforms.

The legitimacy of C.'s method depends upon establishing the continuous existence of the same social system from early times down to the imperial age, to which most of the epigraphical material belongs; hence C.'s attempt to minimize the interruption caused by Agis and Cleomenes, and by Eurycles. She also has to show that an imperial institution not merely existed, but existed with the same emphasis and for the same purpose in, say, the seventh century B.C. Not only is this never proved; but the chapters which seek to establish it repeatedly misunderstand and misinterpret important evidence.

In Appendix III, for example, C. proposes a new chronology for the years 244–214 B.C. which ignores all recent work and is demonstrably false at crucial points. Aristomachus' *strategia* is dated 229/8. This would fix his approach to the Achaean League in 231/30 (Plut. *Arat.* 35. 5); but Polyb. ii. 44. 3 states that together with the other tyrants (except Lydiades) he came over in consequence of Demetrius II's death, and this was certainly not before autumn 230 (probably spring 229). In dating Sellasia to 221 C. shows herself ignorant of the Egyptian evidence which now proves Euergetes to have died in February 221 (cf. Frank, *Arch. Pap.* 1935, 34 f.). Both errors spring from one source—too narrow an approach to Peloponnesian affairs, which cannot be studied in

isolation. Further, C. gratuitously assumes two gross errors in Polybius' account of the *strategiai* of the Social War, chronologically one of the most firmly established periods in the whole of Greek history.

On Agis and Cleomenes C. is not convincing. Her suggestion that the Spartiate territory indicated in Plut. *Agis* 8 lay north of Pellana and Sellasia would leave the central Eurotas valley in perioecic hands; whatever Plutarch originally meant (and wrote), the Pellana-Sellasia line must be the northern and not the southern limit of Spartiate land. C. also believes that Agis and Cleomenes sought to establish a 'moderate oligarchy' with a 'Spartiate élite' controlling a larger but less privileged body of Spartan (not perioecic) citizens. The *εὐζώνοι* with Cleomenes at Sellasia are from this 'less privileged social class'; they are in fact mercenaries (cf. Polyb. ii. 65. 9).¹ The 6,000 of the Spartan phalanx are composed of the 4,000 Spartiates (to which figure Cleomenes originally made up his citizen body) plus the 2,000 freed helots armed in the Macedonian manner (Plut. *Cleom.* 11. 2; 23. 1). C. assumes the 4,000 (like Agis' 4,500) to have been an élite—all fit and of military age. But she misunderstands Plut. *Agis* 8; only the new citizens fulfilled this requirement. C. also denies that Cleomenes abolished the ephorate; but Plut. *Cleom.* 10. 3 (. . . οὐκ ἀνεκτόν), the removal of the ephors' thrones, and, above all, Cleomenes' dream make nonsense on that assumption. The supposed parallel with the Cyrenean constitution seems pure fantasy.

C. regards Flamininus' Isthmus declaration as a modification of 'the first extravagant demand for freedom and autocracy for "all Greek cities both in Europe and in Asia"' (p. 29); misled by Livy's inaccurate translation (33. 30. 2) of the *senatus consultum* in Polybius xviii. 44, 2, she has not seen that the Isthmian declaration was complementary to the *s.c.* Elsewhere she mistranslates or misunderstands Livy. Flamininus, she alleges (p. 34), made the absence of public assemblies at Sparta and Argos a *casus belli* against Nabis; Livy xxxiv. 32. 10 means simply: 'Call a public meeting if you want to hear what people really think.' C. feels sympathy for Nabis (p. 35), accused of attacking Roman transports; but this interference occurred during the war with Philip, not, as C. thinks, when the Romans were attacking Nabis. In Livy xxxiv. 27. 9 *castellani* is Livy's explanation of Polybius' 'helots'; and we know from the *Lex Rubria* that a *castellum* is virtually the same as a *pagus* or *vicus*: *castellani*, then, are *pagani*, country folk. But C. believes Livy's source to be some second-century Roman, and she most improbably makes these helots *neodamodeis* garrisoning a strong point. Her argument that Sparta was a member of the *κοινὸν τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων* never meets the difficulty that *I.G.* v. i. 1226 (c. 70 B.C.) is a proxy-decree of the *κοινὸν* for a Spartan.

The chapter on the ephebic organization is valuable. C.'s convincing argument that the age-group attested by the Herodotus scholion and the inscriptions refer to years 14 to 20, and that a youth became an *eiren* at 20, would have been yet further strengthened had she known of the new Strabo gloss (cf. Diller, *A.J.P.*, 1941, 499-501). It seems unlikely, however, that a *boagos* was an *eiren* claiming victories on behalf of his group. For if *kasenes* became *synepheboi* to *boagoi*, the term *synephebos* is more easily understood of a relationship

¹ In Polyb. ii. 69. 3 τῶν εὐζώνων καὶ μισθοφόρων are probably 'the light-armed mercenaries', just as in v. 36. 3 and 53. 3 τοὺς ξένους καὶ μισθοφόρους are 'the foreign mer-

cenaries'; on the latter passages see M. Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques*, i (1949), 37.

at the same age, like that between *kasenes* and their patrons; and the mistake by which Neon, son of Neon, is called both *kasen* and *synephebos* of the same patron in *I.G.* v. i. 38 and 68 is easier to explain if both *kasenes* and *synepheboi* were of their patron's age. The difference in form between *κάσεν μικιχιζόμενος* and *βοαγός μικιχιζόμενων* (pp. 96-7) seems of no significance in view of the meaning of *βοαγός*. C.'s detailed interpretation of the contests and the flogging ceremony is necessarily tentative, but many of her points are sound.

A separate chapter is devoted to the family of Eurycles. C. translates Josephus, *Bell. Iud.* i. 26. *ἵ πόθῳ χρημάτων εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν προσφθαρείς*, 'to enrich himself in order to make himself king'; thus Eurycles was not tyrant when he visited Herod. But the sense is clearly 'having come to the kingdom (sc. of Judaea) in an evil hour through desire for wealth'. C. tries to dismiss Eurycles' tyranny outright. The coins with *ἐπὶ Εὐρυκλέους* and *ἐπὶ Λάκωνος* do not refer to the father and the son; the office by virtue of which each coined is the high-priesthood of Augustus; and the Spartan Eurycleia is a second-century foundation, despite the Eurycleia at Gytheum in honour of Octavian's friend. *Credat Iudaeus Apella!*

I have no space for C.'s highly hypothetical account of early Sparta. All this needs very careful sifting. There are some good points on Artemis Orthia; but the parallels between the Spartan and Cretan systems suggest Procrustes. On the helots C. is unconvincing; the traditional picture, we are told, is Athenian propaganda. She makes a good case against a seventh-century institution of the *agoge*; but her theory of Spartan 81-year cycles (forerunners via Tarentum of the *ludi saeculares*), which enable her confidently to assign Lycurgus' reforms to 809 B.C., rests on an error in arithmetic. For if A.D. 163 and 242 B.C. were each the last year of a 9-year cycle (pp. 342-3), the period 241 B.C.-A.D. 163 (inclusive) contains 404, not the 405 years the theory demands. Can C. have included a non-existent year o?

This book displays rich imagination, but too rarely what should go with it, a facility for rigorous self-criticism. Too often an hypothesis here becomes a proved fact a few pages farther on, and I noted several arguments in a circle. There is no bibliography of modern works, and it is frequently doubtful whether the author has taken her predecessors into account. For example, the interpretation of *enomotiai* on p. 389 is that of Toynbee, *J.H.S.* 1913, 262 ff.; but this article is not quoted. In general the book fails in its object, and it may well prove seriously misleading to a reader who is not prepared to check and value each statement and reference for himself.

University of Liverpool

F. W. WALBANK

ALEXANDER THE GREAT

FRITZ SCHACHERMEYR: *Alexander der Grosse; Ingenium und Macht*. Pp. 535; 15 plates, 7 maps and plans. Vienna; Pustet, 1949. Cloth, \$1.10.

DR. SCHACHERMEYR's book is evidently a labour of love. He has followed in the steps of his hero, or at least visited the scenes of his chief exploits, as far east as Iraq; he has an attractive narrative style; and his illustrations are excellent, though some of them, at least in my copy, are not exactly where the *Verzeichnis*

says they are. They include portraits of his chief characters, from the monuments, and some splendid photographs of scenery: the Cilician Gates, Tyre (from the air), Siwa, the Hindu Kush, the Gedrosian Desert. They genuinely illustrate the narrative, and form the best series for their purpose which I have seen in any book on Alexander. S. is learned (one need hardly say) both in his sources and in the modern Alexander-literature, though at times he is perhaps over-ready to accept dubious evidence. For example, he uses Tarn (1948), though C. A. Robinson's book 'blieb . . . unerreichbar'; but he continues to believe in the figures of Alexander's alleged concubine Barsine and son Herakles, which one might have supposed that Tarn had finally buried, long since, in the *J.H.S.*

S.'s chief interest in his subject is psychological. He is not greatly interested in the military operations (a pity, since nearly all the undoubted facts about Alexander are of this order). His accounts of them are sketchy, and over some details of them he misunderstands Arrian—e.g. when he asserts that at Gaugamela five regiments of the phalanx were under Alexander's command and one (Krateros) under Parmenion; this is to confuse Krateros' own regiment with the left half of the phalanx, which he also commanded (Arrian iii. 11; cf. ii. 8).

He gives, however, a good, clear, and plausible picture of the human relations on which so much of the tragic side of the story depends, connecting, for example, the early opposition to Alexander among sections of the Macedonian nobility with a supposed dislike of Olympias, 'the foreign woman', and her son, dating from Philip's time. This would naturally have gained weight at the time of Philip's last marriage. He also suggests convincingly that, during the conquest of Persia, hero-worship among the rank and file, who saw the king only from afar, contrasted with the existence of jealousy and mistrust of his very originality, among those circles that knew Alexander as a man. This accounts both for the existence of opposition and even of conspiracies, and for their consistent ineffectiveness. A 'show-down' with the rank and file comes only later, at the Beas and at Opis.

The greatest weakness of the book, at least in the present reviewer's opinion, is in the way in which reasonable interest in the striking and vivid figure of Alexander leads the author on, through turgid pages of speculation, to conclusions which cannot be either disproved or proved. Alexander to him is 'abnorm, aber nicht krankhaft'. S. accounts for his prodigious vigour by supposing him to have lived permanently 'wohl in einem dauernd abnormen Ausnahmestand', to which ordinary mortals only approximate under stress of powerful emotion (pp. 470-1). His favourite designation for his hero is 'der Titan'. He disowns any intention of depicting a perfect Alexander, and denounces as 'Byzantinismen' the attempts of some scholars to gloss over the less pleasing episodes of his career; but some of his suggestions as to Alexander's idea of himself in his last phase are, to say the least, speculative. 'Alexander als Mass aller Dinge' runs a page-heading (p. 483), below which we read: 'Selbstsucht wurde allein dem Gesamten zugebilligt, dem aber schrankenlose, totale Selbstsucht.' His Alexander is a ruthless, mystical-minded Führer, while when, according to S., he pits himself against the Gedrosian desert, or plans to explore Arabia in the monsoon, in a deliberate 'Ringern mit dem Unmöglichen', he behaves like a young Nazi let loose in the Alps. S.'s final summing up is against his hero—'Fate spare us such another!' (p. 496); and in his preface he forswears dictatorship: 'Haben wir doch zur Genüge erfahren, welch peinliche

Seltsamkeiten—um von Schlimmerem gar nicht zu reden—aus dem Rausche der Allmacht erwachsen.' But his general picture of the 'Titan' would, to say the least of it, have occasioned no surprise if published ten years ago.

The book-production is remarkably good for these days. Full references to sources have had to be sacrificed, 'aus wirtschaftlichen Gründen'; so have some detailed appendixes, the publication of which is promised in periodicals. Thirty pages of notes refer to the literature on the chief problems; but—the most astonishing omission in a book on which pains have not been spared—there is no index.

University of Glasgow

A. R. BURN

CONSTANTINE THE GREAT

JOSEPH VOGT: *Constantin der Grosse und sein Jahrhundert*. Pp. 303; 16 plates. Munich: Münchner Verlag, 1949. Cloth and boards, DM. 14.50.

THE second half of Professor Vogt's title is something of a misnomer. The century, outside Constantine's own reign, to which nearly half the book is devoted, is not the fourth, the century dominated by the consequences of C.'s actions, but the third. In contrast, the concluding Part IV, 'Die constantinische Epoche', contains only 14 pages.

However, to criticize the title on this ground is not to criticize the procedure. An introduction to this subject requires a fairly detailed account of the antecedents—the third-century crisis and breakdown, and the Diocletianic restoration (the subjects of Vogt's Parts I and II). With the aid of these, the book will be of interest not only to specialists but to any serious reader wishing for such an introduction to the history of C. and his age. Dr. Vogt's story is eminently readable; to say that his book is also learned is scarcely necessary. In the modern manner, he eschews footnotes, but gives an annotated bibliography to each chapter; and he takes the controversial points, so numerous in the history of C. and his age, in his stride. It is a mark of his dexterity that the names of Alföldi, Baynes, Lietzmann, Piganiol, and other scholars make fairly frequent appearance in the text without seriously interrupting the flow of a swift and lively narrative.

Dr. Vogt is an enthusiast for his hero, and his book is all the better for it. He is undeterred even by such grim episodes as the execution of Crispus or—less notorious but perhaps even more sinister—the fate of the younger Licinius. This does not make him hostile to Diocletian, whom he regards as an *idealistische Weltverbesserer*. He attributes the abandonment of the great persecution to Galerius' personal initiative (p. 154), arguing against Schwartz and Lietzmann that, if C. had had anything to do with it, Eusebius must have stressed a fact so creditable to his hero. He thus brings out the failure of efforts by the State either to suppress the Church or to induce it to compromise, and would not, presumably, accept the view recently put forward by Professor Jones, that if C. had not seen a cruciform solar halo, Europe might today have been bowing the knee to Mars, Mithras, or Mahound. He is perhaps a little facile in his acceptance of ancient statistics; of the story, for instance, that the plague of 166 claimed 2,000 victims in the city of Rome alone, in one day; it is hardly

likely that official returns were kept. But when he comes to the views of modern scholars and to the details of biography and church history which touch the heart of his subject, he is acute and critical.

The book is clearly printed, decently produced for these days, and excellently illustrated. The portrait heads of Constantine and (as is believed) of Licinius, from the Arch of Constantine, are reproduced in the photographs of H. P. l'Orange; and the contrast between the stern face of the older man—no fool, but obviously set in his ways; beard clipped, in the effort to look like Diocletian—and that of Constantine, intelligent, alert, and still very young, adds much to the dramatic effect of the story of their alliance and rivalry, with its tragic denouement. It is the more pity that there are a number of misprints, chiefly in the earlier pages—two of them actually on the cover, in the embossed legend of a well-known coin. *Arattonibus* as one word (p. 113) will not give much trouble to students, but *corrector Ototius rientis* (p. 37) will give pause to some. More serious is the fact that all references to Part I (pp. 12–94) in the index are a page out. The insertion of an erratum slip would appear to be indicated.

University of Glasgow

A. R. BURN

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY

RUDOLF BULTMANN: *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen*. Pp. 263. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1949. Boards, 11.80 Sw. fr.

THIS is easily the most wide-ranging and ambitious of all Professor Bultmann's works: it aims at nothing less than the understanding of Primitive Christianity on the background and in the light of the whole development of Hebraic and Hellenic religion and philosophy. It is hardly possible for any man to have a specialist's knowledge of all the separate parts of this vast field; and Professor Bultmann sees his main task as that of understanding and interpreting the results of specialized research and of finding a vantage point from which they can be seen as parts of a larger picture.

The book begins with an account of the Hebrew and Jewish heritage of Christianity. It is in two main parts, the first dealing with the fundamental religious ideas of the Old Testament, the second with the inter-testamental developments of Jewish theology in Palestine and in the Diaspora. It is significant that the teaching of Jesus is brought in under this head. It is treated as part of the development of Judaism rather than as part of the foundation of Christianity. The Greek heritage likewise is treated in two main parts. The first of these deals with the Greek city-state and the rise of Greek science and philosophy within the framework of the city-state. The second gives an account of the bewildering variety of philosophies and theologies in the Hellenistic and early Graeco-Roman periods. In this section we have outlined the Stoic ideal (with some very acute criticisms), the various astral theologies, the mystery religions, and the Gnostic movement. One misses any treatment of Epicureanism.

Finally, we have an account of Primitive Christianity with a careful attempt to indicate what in it is derived from or modelled on existing religions and philosophies and what is distinct from and even opposed to current ideas. The object is always to bring out and interpret the most characteristic con-

victions of original Christianity in the belief that, when clearly seen and rightly understood, they will be adjudged of perennial moment. Professor Bultmann says to the present-day reader of this book: *tua res agitur*.

It is clearly impossible in a short notice to undertake a detailed examination of all the positions taken up by the author. I find myself wondering whether Greek historians will be prepared to accept all that is said about the city-state. My main criticisms lie in the field of New Testament interpretation. It is, I venture to think, fundamentally unsound to make the work of Jesus an episode in the development of Judaism; and this wrong emphasis leaves the Primitive Church without Founder or foundation. Moreover, the attempt to bring Jesus into the main stream of Jewish life and thought carries with it the danger of laying the main emphasis on the things which he holds in common with his Jewish contemporaries rather than on the profound differences. All our evidence goes to show that the 'prophet of Nazareth' was as big a stumbling-block to his countrymen as the divine Christ of the Church's preaching. But in Professor Bultmann's account the preaching of Jesus becomes chiefly a demand for decision, repentance, and love; and it is not easy to see how a proclamation of this kind should have produced such a violent reaction. That is the main point of disagreement. There are others. But despite all disagreements it must be said that it is a fascinating and stimulating piece of work and not least instructive when it is most provocative.

University of Manchester

T. W. MANSON

HISTORY

KARL JASPERS: *Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte*. Pp. 360. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1949. Cloth.

THIS book is full of hard thinking and hard writing. It aims at displaying the main course of history hitherto, at indicating its main trends in our time, and at suggesting probable lines of future development. The main achievements of mankind hitherto—prehistoric and ancient dynastic—were succeeded about 700–600 B.C. by the 'axis-period' in which man as an individual was liberated from the control of ancient rules-of-force, and enabled to create a rule-of-freedom, in Greece, Israel, Zoroastrian Persia, Buddhist India, and contemporary China. Reinforced by Christianity in the West and Islam in the Middle East, this phase persists. In the whole career of humanity Jaspers presents it as absolutely central. But since the Renaissance it has been confronted in the West, and latterly also everywhere, by a rule-of-reason which has developed into a rule-of-skill or technocracy, in which deliberate planning of man's relations with nature and with other men threatens to limit, if not extinguish, individual freedom.

Clearly it is only the earlier part of this world-history that concerns a classical scholar; but here Dr. Jaspers has much to say that is valuable and stimulating, especially on the character and function of Roman world-empire both before and after its encounter with the Christian Church, and on the conflict of both with the northern peoples of Indo-european origin, which has given a permanent deflection to the 'Western' world, which the 'East' has been spared till our own time.

What is of practical interest, however, even to the classical scholar, is the analysis of modern rationalist technology, with its fresh outlook on nature, production, and labour; and the historical analogy between the close of the 'axis-period' and the modern rules-of-force, national states, and empires. The final section, on the meaning of history, reviews the philosophical concept of freedom, the implications of our present facilities for world-wide organization and intercommunication, and the necessity and possibility of a reformulated faith—in God, in humanity, and in the possibilities of the new order in nature and society—which may save mankind from self-destruction. A very difficult book, but profoundly interesting.

JOHN L. MYRES

GREEK RELIGION

M. P. NILSSON: *A History of Greek Religion*. Second edition. Pp. 316. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. Cloth, 15s. net.

M. P. NILSSON: *The Minoan-Mycenean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion*. Second edition revised. Pp. xxiv+656; 208 ill. Lund: Gleerup, 1950. Paper, kr. 50.

SINCE its first publication in 1925, the merits of Nilsson's *History of Greek Religion* have brought it such wide recognition that the appearance of a second edition calls for little more than a word of welcome and an explanation of its nature. Within its chosen limits, the book remains the survey of a master, illuminating to beginner and expert alike. What these limits are may be suggested by the fact that the name of Plato does not appear in the index, although this omission is not quite fair to the half-dozen references to him in the last chapter, where the effect of philosophic thought on religious beliefs is discussed. In the new edition no changes of substance have been made in the text, which follows exactly the pagination of the first. A new preface reviews briefly the most important discoveries and discussions of the intervening years, which are also taken into account in five pages of 'Notes and Corrections' at the end. These notes also go some way to satisfy W. R. Halliday's plea (*C.R.* xxxix. 183) that references should be given for statements in ancient authors. Many are supplied, but not all. It is a pity that what one might call a hidden quotation is allowed to remain so, as on p. 100, where the statement that 'according to Athenian popular belief the ghost of Orestes used to walk at night, plundering and beating any whom he met' is not attributed to any ancient source, let alone referred precisely to Aristophanes, *Birds* 1390 ff. Yet the opportunity to check the statement is important, since, as Halliday pointed out, the author's interpretation robs Aristophanes' joke of its point. If, however, we remind the reader that many of Halliday's criticisms of the first edition are still worth reading, we must also associate ourselves emphatically with the concluding sentence of his review: 'It is long since I have read a book from which I have learned so much.'

The invaluable *Minoan-Mycenean Religion* has undergone a thorough revision for its second edition. It contains 656 pages as compared with the previous 582, and 208 illustrations to the previous edition's 113 in the text and 4 plates. But it is not simply a question of additional material. Condensation as well as

expansion has resulted from the remoulding by which the author has brought his work into line with the present state of research. To cite an example from the introductory chapter, N.'s view that Mycenaean civilization was the achievement of Greeks who had entered into relations with Crete, rather than of Minoan colonists from Crete, now seems to him to have won sufficient general recognition to make a brief tabulation of the arguments sufficient. On the other hand, the simple statement in the first edition that 'at some time in the second millennium B.C. the Greeks invaded Greece' has disappeared, and been replaced by a full discussion of the most probable date for the earliest Greek immigrations. As was already known, N. favours the break between Middle and Late Helladic rather than that between E. H. and M. H.¹

The great merit of the book lies in its full and fair presentation both of the archaeological evidence for the Minoan-Mycenaean religion itself and of the facts of Greek cult when it comes to estimate Minoan-Mycenaean influence on later Greece. In its own words, 'the foundation must be as firm as possible, for the superstructure to be erected on it is hypothetical enough'. No other scholar could have laid a foundation so broad, deep, and strong, and the result is that when we men of lesser learning come to consider N.'s own hypotheses, we find that he has himself put us in the best position to appraise and criticize. His views, he tells us, have not been essentially changed by recent discoveries and discussions, save on the question of the relations between Minoan and Mycenaean religion, which he treated earlier as practically identical. It is clearly possible for identical artistic representations (and all our evidence comes from these) to cover widely different religious ideas, as do, for example, the representations of Orpheus playing to the animals in pagan art and in the Christian catacombs, and N. is now inclined to think that the art of Minoans and Mycenaean may conceal a similar discrepancy. This results from his work on the survival of Mycenaean religious ideas in Homer. To his well-known view of Athena as successor of the household-goddess of Mycenaean princes he now adds the suggestion that the Homeric concept of fatalism (*Moirai*) was a mark of the Mycenaean civilization. This is, as he admits, highly speculative, since it depends on the argument that 'the Mycenaean people was a warlike people, and their age was filled with wars. Fatalism suits this people and this age extremely well.'

Reading N. on 'The Minoan-Mycenaean Pantheon' and 'Minoan-Mycenaean Religion in its relations to Greek Religion' makes one think that there is one subject in particular to which, in spite of the words which have been lavished upon it, scholars have not yet given the full and unprejudiced consideration that it deserves. N. is distinctly sceptical about the view that the greatest goddess among the Minoans was of the 'Mountain Mother' type exemplified by the Anatolian Kybele. He admits the primary religious importance of the famous seal from Knossos showing the imperious mountain-goddess flanked by obsequious animals (*Min.-Myc. Rel.*² pp. 353, 389 ff.), but insists that this so-called 'Mother of the Mountains' seal in reality shows only a Minoan Mistress of Animals: to go farther is to go beyond the evidence. This is so, and to see in her the Mother-Goddess is to argue from analogy, as N. himself

¹ Cf. *Homer and Mycenae* (1933), p. 83. Naturally enough, many of the ideas conveniently collected in this new edition are already familiar to those who have read the

works produced by the author in the twenty-five years since the publication of the first edition, *Homer and Mycenae, Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology*, etc.

frequently feels justified in doing. So long as we have to rely on purely archaeological evidence for our direct knowledge of Minoan religion, we must either give up hope of knowing anything about it (as one is sometimes tempted to do) or go beyond the direct evidence of the monuments themselves. The view of such authorities as Professors Picard and Persson does rest to some extent on the apparent ubiquity in the whole Aegean area of a mother-goddess with power over the life of men, animals, and vegetation alike. This mother-goddess is depicted as a mistress of animals like the Greek Artemis, and has a definite connexion with mountains, sharing both these characteristics with the goddess on the Cretan seal. She has also a youthful and subordinate consort, and for this too it is possible to see evidence on Minoan monuments, though N. does not think it convincing. It is certain that they show a young male god. There is no reason why the Great Mother should not have acquired different additional functions in different societies, being regarded, in addition to her motherhood, as their especial patron by hunters, seafarers (as the Virgin becomes *Stella Maris*), or warriors. N.'s argument against this is as much *a priori* as those of his opponents, namely: 'The progress of a deity to a wider function and significance, and still more to a wholly dominant position, is the result of a lengthy development of civilisation and religion . . . The evolution logically assumed by those who believe in the Great Minoan Goddess, that she split up later into more specialised divinities, is certainly the inverse of the general religious development as known elsewhere' (p. 393). Is this indubitable? Is not the Great Mother one of the oldest and most nearly universal of all religious conceptions, liable to occur whenever and wherever the conditions of society are suitable, that is, wherever men through hunting, stock-raising, or agriculture have a direct and conscious interest in the life of animals or plants as the means of their own livelihood? The question is of primary importance not only for Minoan religion but for the origin of much in Greek religion and many of its goddesses, for I would venture to say that it may still prove relevant to the original nature of Artemis, Hera, and Athena at least.¹ Here I can do no more than suggest that it needs further thought. We may incline to agree with Evans's view (quoted by Nilsson, p. 393 n.) that 'throughout these changing impersonations we still feel ourselves in the presence of essentially the same divinity'. Yet if N.'s arguments do not seem conclusive here, neither do those who think differently appear to have given them sufficient attention.

Twenty-five years ago this book was hailed as a future classic. The present revision has made its position secure.

Peterhouse, Cambridge

W. K. C. GUTHRIE

A NEW THEORY OF VESTA

ANGELO BRELICH: *Vesta*. (Albae Vigiliae, N.F. VII.) Pp. 120. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1949. Paper, 9.50 Sw.fr.

It is invidious to have to characterize a book written with no little learning and evidently the result of much thought as entirely wrong, but, save for one section to be mentioned later, that is the reviewer's considered judgement on

¹ Professor Cook's conception of Athena (*Zeus*, iii. 224) is not to be regarded as disproved.

this monograph. The author rejects the commonly received idea that Vesta is originally simply the hearth and that her public cult in Rome grew out of the private cult which went on in every house. He does so for reasons which I think utterly inadequate. He remarks that we know nothing of any cult of Vesta earlier than the public one (p. 9), in Rome or elsewhere. This is true, and considering the fragmentary state of our knowledge, it is not at all surprising. Private cults of an early date could in the nature of things leave behind but little monumental and scarcely any literary evidence, while for later times we have to remember the tendency of all nations to take for granted, and so not write about, what is part of everyday usage. He further declares (pp. 14, 15) that the State is the subject of public, the individual of private cult. This is wholly false, for early conditions; private cult is that of a small group, family or clan, which may be, or may come to be, included in the larger unity of a state. He lays stress (p. 18) on the fact that besides the shrine of Vesta there is the hearth of the Regia, and concludes that the *Vesta publica* cannot ever have been the king's hearth. Why a chief cannot have had two fires, one for his own domestic use and one in a kind of outhouse or 'summer kitchen', more available to his subjects, I cannot imagine. He then proceeds to give his own views. Vesta is closely associated with Janus, and that the association has a kind of astrological meaning is shown by the dates of their festivals (pp. 28 ff.). Here he actually adduces, as throwing light on an early period, that in which the twelve-month calendar took shape, the facts that the Agonium of 9 Jan. is under Capricorn and that Manilius says that is Vesta's sign (p. 31). How that or any other astrological notion could possibly have reached Italy something like three centuries before it came to Greece he does not explain. Stranger still is his theory that the round temple denotes the unbroken horizon and that that is why it is not *in agro effato*, since augural procedure involves splitting the horizon up into the four cardinal points (p. 47 and elsewhere). This is one of many places in which he finds a cosmological significance in the simplest details of early Roman worship, such as might perhaps not improperly be looked for if we were dealing with some cult instituted about the time of Aurelian or later. One of his oddest discoveries is that on p. 91, that the mill is 'cosmic', from its shape. For this strange conclusion he seeks evidence (p. 94) in a Pompeian picture of a well-known playful type, in which Hellenistic Erotes are apparently celebrating the Fornacalia. Perhaps wilder still is the statement (p. 96) that it is distinctive of Vesta to have no mythology. The plain fact is that no Roman deity has any. In one place (p. 51) there is an actual mistranslation of a Latin passage. Festus, p. 152, 12 Linds., emphasizes, not that the Vestals might not use standing water for their holy purposes, but that the running water they used must not be taken from the city's water-pipes ('aquam iugem quamlibet praeterquam quae per fistulas uenit'). The former is common form, the latter apparently an archaism not shared by all cults. I lack space to set forth the wild work B. makes (pp. 97 ff.) of the folk-tale, told in several variants, of a girl who was got with child by a spark of fire; it has a well-known Gaelic parallel.

Against all these strange fancies it is pleasant to be able to set one piece of sound negative criticism (pp. 75 ff.). It is perfectly true that the evidence that the *Penates publici* were ever in Vesta's shrine is negligible; they had their own, some way off, on the Velia.

University of St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

ARCHAIC GREEK ART

GEISELA M. A. RICHTER: *Archaic Greek Art against its Historical Background*. Pp. xxv + 226; 337 figs. on 107 plates. New York and London; Oxford University Press, 1949. Cloth, 63s. net.

A HISTORY of archaic Greek art was due to be written about this time, for reasons well set out by Miss Richter in the preface to this important book. The subject is significant in itself: 'Archaic Greece is . . . in a sense the cradle of Western civilization', and this is true in art as well as in other fields; 'during the century or two that it [the archaic period] lasted, Greek artists discovered step by step the true nature of appearance'. Further, 'archaic art is understood by the present generation', and 'is valued for its own sake'; and also 'in the last ten or fifteen years our knowledge of archaic Greek art has greatly increased' through excavation and study.

I should myself like to see a new history of archaic art included in a larger new history of Greek art as a whole. Our increased knowledge and understanding of archaic art has modified our view of Greek art in its later developments, and the whole field needs a fresh review. However, that is no criticism of this book; a history of archaic art alone is a fair and timely undertaking, and the book itself is in many respects admirable. Miss Richter knows the field of archaic Greek art (and indeed that of later Greek art too) as well as any, and understands it much better than most; yet I am not entirely happy about her presentation of it here. The book is intended for laymen as well as scholars, and it is notoriously hard for one of the latter to judge the effect of a work in his own subject on someone who comes to it fresh, but I suspect that such a one would here find himself confused and consequently perhaps bored; which would be a great pity. There is no writer on my subject whom I read with more pleasurable profit than Miss Richter in her articles, and in books like *Kouroi* and *Archaic Attic Gravestones* which are works of original research, but I felt a disappointment akin to that I feel over this book in her *Attic Red-figured Vases*. The reason I suspect is that Miss Richter is too pure a scholar to be good at summarizing and generalizing—activities which entail simplifications, suppressions, and even distortions of particular truths, and therefore do violence to the spirit of the true scholar. It is perhaps fair to say that the best scholars are not the best summarizers and popularizers.

This over-scholarly approach is shown primarily in the arrangement of the book. It is divided into three periods, each of which is treated in two chapters, one on Mainland Greece, the other on the Islands, East Greece, Asia (in various forms in the different periods), and the West. Within the chapters objects are treated by their find-spots, and in the first and last periods Olympia, because of its richness and its international character, is isolated from Mainland Greece and produced as a *bonne bouche* at the end.

Miss Richter emphasizes the way in which archaic art seems to have developed on much the same lines and at much the same speed in all its various centres, and (rightly I think) soft-pedals the attempts to distinguish local schools of sculpture, but her arrangement makes this all-over development extremely hard to follow. Moreover, the system leads her to choose for preference objects whose find-spots are known, though these are not necessarily the best. The illustration of the crude and battered statue dedicated on Delos by

Nikandre of Naxos, in preference to the closely similar but far finer and better preserved Auxerre figure (which only gets a mention in a footnote to the Prusias statues), is perhaps justified by Nikandre's being probably the earliest life-size stone figure surviving from Greece; but the fragment from Aegina (figs. 44, 45) really tells one little but that early archaic marble sculpture has been found there, while the miserable object from Halai (fig. 155) has no place in a general history of archaic Greek art, and the other things illustrated on the same plate are not much better. Moreover, too rigid adherence to a division by time and place produces some absurd effects: Clazomenian vases are discussed on p. 113, Fikellura on p. 119, Chalcidian and Caeretan (the Busiris hydria is not, alas! in London—one of the very few errors I have noticed in this admirably accurate and well-documented work) on p. 129, and Clazomenian sarcophagi on p. 172. The treatment of vase-painting, indeed, shows some uncertainty of plan. It is very properly subordinated to sculpture, but towards the end Miss Richter seems to treat it rather cavalierly: three cup-*tondos*, by Euphronios and the Brygos Painter, are surely not only an inadequate but an ill-balanced representation of the splendid and varied production of Athenian potteries in the last decade of the sixth century and the first two of the fifth.

These seem to me the faults of a valuable book, but I recognize that the material of archaic Greek art is extremely difficult to present, and I find Miss Richter's scholarly austerities infinitely preferable to the mellifluous generalities of some approaches to the subject. Almost anything one wants to know is here, and I am very likely wrong in feeling that it could have been made easier to assimilate. The illustrations, a most important part of such a book, are in the main admirably chosen to cover the field and to excite interest; and Miss Richter has contrived to include much recent or little-known material. It is fine to see the Megara torso (fig. 149), which must have been one of the best of all *kouroi*, properly valued and taking its place in a book of this kind; and at the other end of the scale we have such delightfully chosen *Kleinkunst* as the South Italian terra-cottas of figs. 274-6. Of recent discoveries one may choose (from among many) to mention the metopes from the temples of Hera Argeia in Lucania (figs. 204-6 and 291), the bronzes (figs. 86-9, 292-3, and 299), and especially the big terra-cottas (figs. 289-90 and 295-6) from Olympia, finds in many materials from Samos (figs. 61, 63, and 256-9), the wooden statuettes from Sicily (figs. 82 and 84), and the ivories from Delphi (figs. 196-9. The statuette, fig. 196, is accidentally classed on p. 121 among the reliefs, figs. 197-9; its very curious style has of course no connexion with theirs, and is perhaps oriental rather than orientalizing Greek). It is not Miss Richter's fault that she cannot illustrate the archaic wooden panels from near Sicily, the only Greek panel paintings known, found some sixteen years ago and still, incredibly, unpublished. The introduction of peripheral pieces, e.g. from Spain (figs. 280-1) and Persia (fig. 273), is an original and valuable idea. I wish that beside the Achaemenid relief (fig. 273) which, as she says, shows Greek affinities and may well have been cut by Greek workmen, Miss Richter could have found room (perhaps by omitting the panel from the Harpy Tomb—a dull work, I always think) to illustrate her fascinating discovery (*A.J.A.* L. 28 and fig. 26) of heads and animals sketched, unquestionably by a Greek artist working off the record, on the shoe of a statue of Darius from Persepolis.

HELLENISTIC PORTRAITURE

Ernst BUSCHOR: *Das hellenistische Bildnis*. Pp. 71; 62 ill. on 16 plates. Munich: Biederstein, 1949. Cloth, DM. 12.

HELLENISTIC portraiture has remained one of the most obscure fields in classical archaeology; experts can still dispute whether a particular head represents Menander or Virgil and dates from 290 or from 20 B.C. That is an extreme case but indicative of the prevalent lack of stylistic criteria for dating, as a result of which no one can feel assured of many identifications of portraits with historic personages. Now, however, one of the greatest of classical archaeologists has tackled the whole problem of Hellenistic portraiture, attempting to analyse the characteristics of each generation of sculptors and so to arrange all the more notable portraits in a chronological sequence. To my mind there can be no possibility of arriving by stylistic means at such accurate dating—he even distinguishes the products of a particular decade; but an acceptable system of mere token dating would itself form a spectacular advance.

A comparative study of some four hundred portraits and many other sculptures, etc., would inevitably make hard reading, and both author and publisher have conspired to enhance its difficulty. The entire text amounts to less than 25,000 words including the references, all of which are interpolated within brackets in the same type; not even the small mercy of italics is vouchsafed us, though a single sentence is apt to be cluttered with several lines of them. The aesthetic criticism is penetrating and sound but expressed in terms which demand much thought of anybody inexperienced in the jargon of modern German writing on art; we are, for instance, conducted from the *überpersönliche Welt* to the *Dingwelt* and then onwards to the *Bildwelt*. The precise sense of many adjectives and equivalent expressions is liable to escape an English reader, try he never so hard. But he will sometimes find a clue by comparing the words with the illustrations, which are excellent considering their size (roughly 3 inches square). Unfortunately they include less than one in six of the works under discussion. Moreover, there are few libraries in this country in which to look up the remainder, while perhaps none contains every publication cited in the references. In any case photographs alone do not provide an adequate basis for stylistic criticism, and only an insignificant proportion of the material can be studied in casts—mainly belonging to the first half of the period, in which the course of development is comparatively clear.

The reviewer happens to have been tolerably familiar in the past with a large number of the originals, and a week spent with the book in a library and cast gallery has resulted in at least one firm conviction: that this is an exceptionally able piece of research, and if it has not indeed solved the problem (in broad outline, naturally, not in all detail), it will have brought the solution immeasurably nearer. The earlier sections, covering the period 325–150 B.C., are fairly conservative and cannot be far wrong; the new datings here seem very plausible for the most part, though two or three strike me as most unlikely. The account of the next century and a half is pioneer work and rich in novelties; many of the verdicts on individual portraits bring immediate conviction, but I cannot attempt to assess the credibility of the scheme as a whole. Etruscan and Roman as well as Greek works enter into it, yet among all these very few

can be dated with assurance; the great edifice of theory stands on such a weak basis of fact that its accuracy will need to be tested through years of debate.

Jesus College, Cambridge

A. W. LAWRENCE

GREEK ALTARS

CONSTANTINE G. YAVIS: *Greek Altars: Origins and Typology*. An Archaeological Study in the History of Religion. (St. Louis University Studies, Monograph Series. Humanities, No. 1.) Pp. xxiii + 266: 93 ill. St. Louis, Mo.: St. Louis University Press, 1949. Cloth, \$6.

THIS elaborate dissertation assembles practically all the archaeological evidence as to the prehellenic, Cypriot, and Greek apparatus for the receipt of offerings of any kind. The material is classified into types and sub-types, each with a study of its evolution and of its ritual appropriateness. The grouping, while necessarily somewhat arbitrary, will be very helpful. Considering the vast number of publications involved, accidental omissions might well abound, but the reviewer has thought of only one that might affect the argument—the suggestion (by Ashmole, *J.H.S.* xlii, 1922, p. 253) that a sacrificial hollow at Locri may have been screened by sculptures of complex symbolism, the Ludovisi and Boston ‘thrones’. Intentional omissions, to restrict the scope of the book, are more numerous; some groups of apparatus are treated in a selective or summary manner on the ground that they have little typological interest. For this reason, comparatively few domestic altars are listed, and among those omitted is unfortunately one which supplies a link between Greek and Roman usage, an altar at Delos on the sides of which paintings are still visible, including a scene of *togati* making offerings (*B.C.H.* xlvii, 1923, p. 455). Only in such exceptional cases have paintings survived, but they may have been a regular feature on altars as a cheap substitute for sculpture, which, of course, would have been similarly coloured.

The early sections raise one issue of exceptionally wide import. The discrepancies between the prehellenic and the classical apparatus for offerings lead the author to conclude that the practice of burning the flesh of a sacrificial victim entered Greece with the Dorians. He points out that there is evidence of a drastic change in the system of offerings, though not in every respect, about 1000 B.C. Before this time no true altars are known, and he goes so far as to claim that there exists no indication of animal sacrifice having taken place during the Bronze Age. Certainly there can exist very little indication of it, but the unqualified statement seems to me to rest on a quibble, for he admits evidence of ceremonial meat feasts in the Bronze Age while denying that they could have been sacrificial (pp. 25, 39–41). At the beginning of the Iron Age, he believes, both official ceremonial feasts and sacrificial feasts must have been held at the same spot, on the argument that the excavators found too large a deposit of ashes to be due entirely to sacrifices and that only the smaller bones bear traces of fire (p. 69). Since the Greeks rarely indulged in holocaust but usually partook of the flesh of a victim, the inference would seem unjustified in this case, and I see no reason why a similar conjunction of sacrifice and feast should not be conceivable of the Bronze Age people. Neither the absence of imperishable cult-objects at the places of their feast, nor the lack of a hearth in

cert
side
of t
suit
cou
that
luck
mor
Oly
scen
ther
was
subs
if th
vent
indc
toler
from
T
posi
least
impe
and
whic
to th
The
likev
Jen

D. H
Select
Met
I: A
Brill

Dr. V
selecti
and I
Alkest
edition
lingui
comm
to dra
pretat
out ap
readin

certain other of their sanctuaries where such objects do remain, can be considered to prove the thesis. It must be remembered that the average sanctuary of that period consisted of a room in a residential building, and a more unsuitable situation for a place of sacrifice can hardly be imagined. Animals could have been sacrificed outside the settlements, in the Homeric fashion; in that case one would expect the spot to remain unidentified except by some lucky chance. For that matter, excavation has failed to reveal any trace of the monstrous heap of blood, mud, and ash that formed the altar of Zeus at Olympia. This is a typical instance of the fact that in the Hellenic period the scenes of most frequent sacrifice lay in sanctuaries remote from habitation, and there could have been Bronze Age precedents for that siting. In any case it was obviously desirable, if not essential. The classical Greeks burnt aromatic substances at a sacrifice to sweeten the smells of blood and scorching flesh, but if they did their best to keep their altars clean they could scarcely have prevented some of the stench from lingering all through the dry weather. An indoor altar for blood sacrifices would have made a Bronze Age palace intolerable; Cortez's soldiers, who cannot be accused of being lily-livered, fled from the blood-drenched walls of a Mexican temple.

The book's main question seems therefore to have been answered more positively than our sparse facts allow, though in perfect accordance with at least the majority of them. But the prehellenic and Dark Age sections, while important, comprise only a small part of the whole. Among the descriptions and discussions of material of the classical epoch are scattered many passages which illustrate Greek thought and custom, but the text adheres too closely to the painstaking form of a *catalogue raisonné* to be readable continuously. The illustrations have been most thoughtfully selected, and the index apparatus likewise maintains the same high standard of informativeness and clarity.

Jesus College, Cambridge

A. W. LAWRENCE

SHORT REVIEWS

D. F. W. VAN LENNEP: *Euripides, Selected Plays. With Introduction, Metrical Synopsis, and Commentary. I: Alkestis*. Pp. vii+156. Leiden: Brill, 1949. Cloth, 6.50 g.

DR. VAN LENNEP has undertaken to edit a selection of the plays of Euripides with Notes and Introduction in English, of which his *Alkestis* is the first. Striking features of this edition are the comparative disregard of linguistic and textual matter traditional in commentaries and the great attention paid to dramatic points and psychological interpretation. The Oxford text is printed without apparatus, but in cases where a different reading is adopted, about twenty in this

play, the fact is mentioned in the Notes. This is certainly a change in the right direction, and the shift of emphasis will be approved by most readers. But it is a question whether the editor has not carried too far the subordination of linguistic problems. Though the majority of users may be more interested in the play as a play than as a specimen of Attic Greek, their first need is to construe it, and some may feel that they are not given as much help as they have a right to expect. There is no note, for example, on *ἐνεστῶτος* at 797 or on *ἀντιρεπῶν* at 972. Still, in general first things are put first.

In the thirty-six pages of Introduction attempts to base the interpretation of the play on reconstructions of the *Alkestis* legend are rightly dismissed as unprofitable, and

the theme of the play is discussed, at times with considerable insight. But an editor living, as he must, for a long period in the company of his play is always liable to come to think of it, not as a drama produced on a particular occasion, but as a record of an event in the past, and, as the reality of it all grows on him, to fill in details both of incident and character which are beyond the intention, and would probably be beyond the comprehension, of the dramatist. Though Dr. Van Lennep is aware of this danger, and gives some salutary warnings against trying to answer questions which Euripides knew his audience would not ask, he does not altogether escape it. Alcestis, it seems to me, died for her husband because she was passionately determined to do what she conceived to be her duty as a wife. Her love was reserved for her children. But the present editor goes far beyond this, and finds Alcestis 'very sure of herself and a little domineering'. He detects in her wish that Admetus should not marry again an underlying desire for the continuance of her own glory. Similarly, with regard to Admetus we are told that 'he is not changed from within' when he returns from burying his wife, and with reference to line 954 that 'his conscience seems to trouble him less than public opinion'. And although Admetus' assertion that he wishes he had not been prevented from throwing himself into his wife's grave need not be taken quite literally, the comment that 'the risk of his being buried alive was actually small' does not suggest a fully sympathetic approach. However, so long as the reader preserves his independence of judgement he is more likely to be stimulated than misled by a coherent, if over-elaborate, presentation of the characters.

Other plays in this series will be welcome, but it is to be hoped that the printing of them will be more accurate. There are a number of misprints in the Greek text and more in the English parts; they are frequent enough to put the reader off, and the instruction 'supple *adrob*' may, unless he is a hardened textual critic, cause him a moment of perplexity as well.

D. W. LUCAS

King's College, Cambridge

M. M. SHARIF: *Three Lectures on the Nature of Tragedy*. Pp. 110. Lahore: Asiatic Publishers, 1947. Cloth, Rs. 5.

In these three lectures Professor Sharif examines, from the point of view of a modern

reader interested in the nature of tragedy, the contribution of Aristotle to this question. Aristotle he treats with respect, but not with reverence, and in his lively and intelligent, though necessarily rather sketchy, discussion of the definition of tragedy, of *catharsis*, and of imitation he makes no excessive claims for the validity of the answers. Indeed, he might have made a stronger case in favour of Aristotle's theory of imitation by stressing the implications of his comparison of poetry and history. But he rightly refuses to accept attempts to stretch the meaning of *mimesis*.

S. finds the Aristotelian account of tragedy too narrow even for much ancient drama, but he makes it narrower than it need be by excluding from *dramata* all but purely intellectual error. Aristotle probably drew a less firm line than we do between intellectual and emotional impulses. On the other hand, he is much more indulgent to the theory of *catharsis*, and brings in perhaps more of modern psychological theory than is justified. But he rightly lays emphasis on Aristotle's complete indifference to the creative or imitative processes of the writer, which is no doubt due largely to the inadequacy of the theory of *mimesis* itself.

The presentation is not always free from jargon and there are a number of printer's errors, but these lectures raise the essential problems of the *Poetics* and supply many sensible observations on them.

D. W. LUCAS

King's College, Cambridge

GÜNTHER GOLDSCHMIDT: *Menander: die Komödien und Fragmente*, Übertragen und eingeleitet. Pp. lxiv + 168; 8 plates. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1949. Cloth, 11.80 Sw. fr.

THIS beautifully produced little book contains verse translations of selected fragments of Epicharmus, Alexis, Philemon, and Menander, translations of the Menander/Glykera letters of Alciphron (which according to the author 'really breathe something of the spirit which gives this comedy its life') and of Plutarch's comparison of Aristophanes and Menander; the illustrations include a page of the Geneva papyrus, the Lateran relief, and other pictures of comedy. The translations from Menander include all the longer papyrus fragments except *Therphoroumene*, *Koneiazomenai*, *Misoumenos*, and *Perinthia*. They read easily, but there are occasional inaccuracies such as a mistrans-

lation of the unreal condition in *Perik.* 236 and of *ῥυμωπία* in *Perik.* 253 as 'Ehre' and the curious transposition of the eight lines of the *Phasma* to follow l. 25. Dr. Goldschmidt does not reconstruct but gives a brief note of what has happened in the gaps: some of his suggestions seem to the reviewer unlikely, e.g. that Charisios had a full discussion with Smikrines, that Polemon himself found Glykera in the arms of Moschion, and that Pataikos was 'almost certainly' the husband of Myrrhine. A long and interesting introduction traces the history of comedy from the time of Epicharmus and gives full weight to the influence of philosophy and tragedy on Menander (curiously the connexion of the *Epitrepontes* with the *Alope* is not mentioned). It is a pity that Dr. Goldschmidt did not elaborate the contrasts between Menander, Diphilus, and Philemon; we have enough evidence to appreciate their differences and it is just perverse to say that the relationship between Philemon and Menander is shown by their use of common titles: 'thus for example Philemon also wrote a *Phasma* which was the original of Plautus' *Mostellaria*.' Could the ghost theme be used more differently?

T. B. L. WEBSTER

University College, London

RAFFAELLO DEL RE: *Plutarcho, Vita di Bruto*. Revisione del testo, introduzione e note. Pp. xxxi + 79. Florence: Le Monnier, 1948. Paper, L. 180.

PLUTARCH'S *Lives of Dion and Brutus* are among his best, and one need not look far for the motive which has led Dr. Del Re to publish school editions of them in post-war Italy. His *Dion* appeared in 1946; the *Brutus* now follows with the *Comparison* appended. The introductory essay on Plutarch and the *Lives* is reprinted unchanged from the *Dion*; it is comprehensive and reliable, and will give the Italian schoolboy the information he needs. The observations on Brutus which follow perhaps share too closely the pancyrally tone of the text; they say nothing, for instance, of the intricate and disingenuous game which Cicero found him playing in the finances of Salamis (*ad Att.* v. 21; vi. 1).

Del Re's notes are somewhat too ready to translate the hard passages instead of giving the right hint; and occasionally there is no note where an intelligent boy might look for one, for instance on why Cassius as aedile

was in possession of lions (8. 6), or who the Polybius was whom Brutus was epitomizing at Pharsalus (4. 8). Errors are rare; but one, shared by Liddell-Scott-Jones (s.v. ἀναφέρειν 11.), perhaps deserves mention. Posidonius said that some men of Brutus' family ἀναφέρειν . . . πρὸς τὸν ἀνδριάντα τοῦ Βρούτου (the consul of 509) τὴν ὁμοιότητα τῆς ιδέας (1. 8). Del Re translates 'richiamavano, per la somiglianza dell' aspetto, la statua di Bruto'. The sense is surely 'they (consciously) referred to Brutus' statue their similarity of feature (i.e. as proof of kinship)'. Similarly in *Moralia* 53 d ἀναφέρειν τὰς ὁμοιότητας indicates a positive action (of a painter 'bringing out a resemblance'). The Empylus of 2. 4, we are told, 'non ci è noto da alcun'altra fonte'; he is almost certainly the *Empylus Rhodius* whose good memory Quintilian x. 6. 4 records on Cicero's authority. The text follows that of Ziegler (1932); it corrects one misprint, but introduces at least a score of new ones, which are not worth listing here. Altogether this is a useful addition to a competent series.

F. W. WALBANK

University of Liverpool

R. G. BURY: Sextus Empiricus. Vol. iv. *Against the Professors*. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. vii + 409. London: Heinemann, 1949. Cloth, 15s. net.

DR. BURY has completed his Loeb Sextus (*C.R.* xlviii, p. 198; xlix, p. 225; l, p. 200) with this volume, which adds the six books that he originally intended to omit. They are those directed against Teachers of Letters and of Rhetoric, against Mathematicians, Geometers, Astrologers, and Musicians (*adv. M.* i-vi). Although they contain some good sense, they do not show Sextus at his best, since he displays more than ordinary captiousness. Dr. Bury, on the other hand, excels his previous work. He has given careful attention to the text, into which he introduces some forty conjectures of his own, almost all convincing or at least likely, besides making full use of Heintz. The translation flags a little towards the end, but in the earlier books is praiseworthy both for its accuracy and for its ease.

Few people today know anything of ancient astrology. It would have been a service to the rest, who include the reviewer, if Dr. Bury had extended his own knowledge, the limits of which are illustrated by his translation of v. 39, and made it available in

a few short notes. As it is, he copies a useful diagram from Fabricius and a piece of nonsense from Bekker, where a reference to the sixth book of Manilius might have put him on his guard. The technical terms of ancient musicians might also have had more attention. To render *συμφωνία* by 'symphony' is too archaic, and 'By-Fives' and 'By-Alls' for *διὰ πέντε* and *διὰ πασάν* are just baffling. But gratitude for the pertinacity that has translated all Sextus must outweigh any minor complaints.

F. H. SANDBACH

Trinity College, Cambridge

GIORGIO FANO: *Teosofia Orientale e Filosofia Greca*. Preliminari ad ogni storiografia filosofica. Pp. 229. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1949. Paper.

THIS is primarily an essay in the philosophy of history of Italian idealism, in which the author's metaphysical interests have led him to attempt to clarify philosophically the places of primitive, oriental, and Hellenic thought as three moments forming a triad in the dialectical progress of Spirit (to use his own terminology), the third representing a stage beyond the other two.

In this he lays himself open to attack from various quarters, from philosophers who find his approach unsympathetic, and from specialists who see their fields cursorily traversed by a writer dependent largely on secondary sources and manipulating a terminology unfamiliar to them.¹ British philosophers rarely feel kindly disposed towards the metaphysical conceptions which loom across the pages of Italian idealism, imported largely from Teutonic sources; scholars will find F. sketchy and inadequate; and both will judge his treatment schematic, unelastic, and abstract.

Nevertheless it is worth while to get behind the forms of expression and to make allowances for the manner of treatment. Comparison of primitive, oriental, and Hellenic modes of thinking is necessary if we are to see classical antiquity in its true setting; this is F.'s aim, and no one can hope for detailed acquaintance with all the aspects involved. F.'s insistence that it is with the ideas of primitive man, and not with the Greeks, that the history of philosophy should

ideally commence, and the outline he gives of them, throw the Greek achievement into proper relief, as does from another angle the contrast with the East, documented from Indian and Jewish sources. He emphasizes the part played by magic among primitive communities (and, for example, in Babylonian astronomy) and by sacerdotal castes among the orientals, the stress on authority and tradition and the letter of a sacred text, the merging of the individual in a social or religious collectivity, and the place accorded to mystical intuition as the highest form of apprehension; with these he contrasts the secular, rationalistic, and mathematical approach of the Greeks and their marked individualism, while recollecting the primitive traces in the semi-mythical character of much early Greek philosophy, the collective anonymity of the Pythagorean and Hippocratic schools (p. 122), and the union of mysticism and rationalism in the Pythagoreans, Parmenides, and Plato. He might have added the recurrent conception of a world-soul. He reminds us, too, that Greek philosophy, with its emphasis on mathematical thinking, appears abstract and inadequate now that modern science and historiography have enriched our experience, and he recognizes the manifold permeation of the modern world by the Judeo-Christian tradition.

For the painstaking reader F. provides much that is illuminating, as when he points out (pp. 138-40) the decisive criticism received by the abstract rationalism of classical Greek philosophy in the sceptical and sensationalist tendencies of the post-Aristotelian schools, which significantly enjoyed a renewed vogue when modern science and philosophy began in the seventeenth century. But he is too cursory to be satisfactory. The treatment of Aristotle's God (p. 137) is misleading, and elsewhere he overstates the Greek conquest of primitive notions of an overriding destiny (p. 165): destiny overshadows history for Herodotus (who uses conceptions of Heraclitus), and Greek thought was riddled with notions of *τύχη* and *ἀνάγκη* (cf. for example, Timoleon's shrine to *Ἀντοπαρία*). As examples of Greek specialization (by contrast with the Eastern wise man) he unfortunately singles out, among others, such encyclopaedic writers as Aristotle (who, despite F., did write hymns) and Galen (p. 125). Nor was Berosus quite a contemporary of Alexander the Great (p. 88).

For primitive man F. relies on the school of Lévy-Brühl. But not all anthropologists would concur, and it seems unpalatable to speak with Lévy-Brühl and F. of a pre-

¹ P. M. Schuhl, *Essai sur la formation de la pensée grecque* (Paris, 1934) is more satisfactory.

logical thinking; there are other treatments, as by Malinowski, in a field where general agreement is lacking.

D. A. REES

University College, Bangor

CYRIL BAILEY: *Lucretius*. (British Academy: Annual Lecture on a Master Mind.) Pp. 20. Oxford University Press, 1949. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.

In this lecture Dr. Bailey advances the claim of Lucretius to be ranked as a 'Master Mind' 'not only for his thought, not only for his poetry, but for his unique achievement in welding them together into a massive and magnificent whole'. It is curious that Lucretius should have himself compared his poetry to the honey that is smeared on the lip of a cup to entice children into drinking the bitter medicine it contains. There is no doubt that Lucretius did himself less than justice, for, as Santayana put it, poetry cannot be spread on a thing like butter; it must play on it like light. But although Lucretius certainly transformed the system of Epicurus by expressing it in a medium far outside the compass of its inventor, there must remain a doubt whether the process required a purely intellectual equipment of a brilliance comparable to that of the poetic gift displayed. Dr. Bailey, writing with his usual felicity, makes a strong case in favour of the claim of Lucretius to possess intellectual gifts of a high order, and manages within the limits of a single lecture to say a surprising amount both about the style and about the substance of the poem.

D. W. LUCAS

King's College, Cambridge

Livy. With an English translation by FRANK GARDNER MOORE. In fourteen volumes. Vol. VIII: Books XXVIII-XXX. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xii+562; 9 maps. London: Heinemann, 1949. Cloth, 15s. net.

THE new volume of the Loeb *Livy* closes the gap which has existed since volume ix appeared in 1935. In plan it resembles the editor's earlier volumes; there is an Appendix on 'The Zama Problem' which concludes

that 'we need not hesitate to speak of the B. of Margaron' or perhaps of 'Zama-Margaron'. Special indebtedness is again recorded to Conway and Johnson (Oxford text, vol. iv), but the text here given differs from theirs in some 170 places. The extent of the apparatus desirable in a Loeb edition of *Livy* is no easy problem, and readers will certainly differ in their views both about the editor's citations and about his omissions. Many readings of *H* and *V* are quoted, but neither is mentioned in the account of the manuscripts (pp. vii-ix). The translation in general is somewhat smoother than in some previous volumes, and at times shows skill in breaking down the complexity of the original. But much unnecessary roughness remains—e.g. xxviii. 24. 6, xxix. 2. 15, or xxx. 12. 2 (S. was 'captured and brought alive to L., a welcome sight presently to M. above all others')—and though serious mistranslations are absent minor inaccuracies are not infrequent; typical are xxviii. 9. 4 and 9 *rem publicam gessissent, bellum g.*, 'carried on the war', 'conducting the war' (contrast xxx. 2. 7 *viginti legionibus res Romana gesta* 'the R. state was administered with . . .'); xxviii. 9. 16, 'such was the talk of the spectators who accompanied N.' *Vibellius*' name (xxviii. 28. 4) is not *Decimus*, but *Decius*; the details of the *Frosinone* portent (xxx. 2. 12) can hardly be correct, and the translation 'by precincts' for *vicatim* (xxx. 26. 6) is misleading; nor is *fori* 'market-place' in xxx. 37. 9. In xxviii. 32. 9 insert *fretos* between *armis* and *pugnatorum*; in xxix. 1. 10 correct *quai*, and in 18. 20 for *liberatur* read *liberetur*. On p. 303 (margin) read B.C. 204; p. 516, for the second date read A.U.C. 553. Misprints elsewhere include pp. 481 and 531 (marginal dates), p. 212 n. 1 (Casear), and p. 314 n. 2 (τοῦ Καλοῦ ἀκροτήριον and τὸ Καλὸν ἀκροτήριον).

G. CLEMENT WHITTICK

King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

JOSEPH A. MAURER: *A Commentary on C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita C. Caligulae Caesaris, Chapters I-XXI*. Pp. 108. Philadelphia: privately printed, 1949. Paper.

THIS book, which was presented successfully as a dissertation for a doctorate in the University of Pennsylvania, is a commentary on the first twenty-one chapters of Suetonius' life of Gaius and is constructed on the same general lines as J. R. Rietra's very workmanlike commentary on chapters 24-40 of

Suetonius' life of Tiberius. It has no introductory passages—nothing on the general manuscript tradition, nothing on Suetonius' value as a source of historical knowledge. This last gap may be regretted, since chapter 8, where the birthplace of Gaius is discussed, reveals Suetonius in a very rare mood, the mood of a careful scholar intelligently criticizing the divergent accounts of his sources.

Maurer gives at the start the list of the works which he has consulted. They are, in the main, the standard works, and Maurer, abbreviating what he has found in them, gives succinct, businesslike notes on the personages, places, and events which, in these twenty-one chapters, Suetonius mentions. Sometimes he is timid; for instance where he writes of the *Puteolanae moles* in chapter 19, 'Karl Baedeker (*Southern Italy and Sicily*, p. 119) states that the *moles Puteolanae* were built of brick and puzzolano earth in twenty-five separate buttresses supporting twenty-four arches; that a storm injured these docks at the close of Hadrian's reign and that it was Antoninus Pius who restored them in the year 139. Baedeker, however, fails to list sources for these statements', and leaves it at that. A little more research would have found in H. Stuart Jones's *Companion to Roman History*, p. 156, a far better account of the harbour works in question and, in *C.I.L.* x. 1640, the inscription which justifies Baedeker's statement about Hadrian and Antoninus Pius. Sometimes, on the other hand, Maurer is far too bold. His comparison of the carrying home of the ashes of Agrippina and of those of 'Demetrius I, King of Macedonia (338-283 B.C.)' on p. 58 has nothing at all to commend it, and his further comparison of the same event with 'the arrival of the Magna Mater from Pessinus in Phrygia in the year 204 B.C.' and his suggestion that 'it may be that Gaius was contemplating the establishment of a cult of his family patterned after that of the Magna Mater' (p. 58) is one which requires for its support a disconcert with Gaius' attested acts in particular and with Roman religion in general. Again, there are occasional statements (for example on p. 53 about the *aerarium* in connexion with an emperor's legacies and on p. 97 about *amici*) to which it is very difficult indeed to attach any helpful meaning.

However, for anyone who, confining his attention to 'Gaius the Princeps' and avoiding 'Gaius the Monster', is restricting his reading to the first twenty-one chapters of Suetonius' *Vita* and wants quickly to acquire a résumé of all that is known, for instance,

about Germanicus or Artabanus or the theatre of Pompey, these notes, the evident result of much painstaking work, will, no doubt, not be without their value.

J. P. V. D. BALEDON

Exeter College, Oxford

JACOB HENDRIK KOOPMANS. *Augustinus' Briefwisseling met Dioscorus*. Inleiding, tekst, vertaling, commentaar. Pp. 278. Amsterdam: Jasonpers, 1949. Paper.

THIS correspondence consists of two letters. One, somewhat ill-mannered and illiterately expressed, is the covering letter to a paper of questions arising from Cicero's philosophical works, addressed to Augustine by a young student of Greek origin at the end of his studies in Carthage. The other is Augustine's lengthy reply, reproaching the young man for his bad manners and for wasting a busy bishop's time over such trivialities, and showing by a summary outline of Greek philosophy as mediated by Cicero the inconclusiveness and inutility of these ethical, physical, and epistemological speculations. Finally Augustine relents so far as to annotate the required answers in the margin of his correspondent's paper. The sole importance of these letters seems to be that Augustine had at hand a copy of Cicero, *de natura deorum*, and that his quotations from it suggest improvements on the current texts of that work: e.g. at *N.D.* i. 114 *affluent* (with cod. B) for *affluant*.

Dr. Koopmans has produced a very learned piece of work with little left unsaid that could be gathered from wide reading of authorities both ancient and modern. The bibliography is impressive. A summary (pp. 233 to 240), in grammatical but hardly idiomatic English, rehearses the main points of the Introduction and Commentary. An imposing index of Latin words will demand the attention of future lexicographers.

E. EVANS

BOETHIUS: *Trost der Philosophie*. Lateinisch und deutsch, übertragen von EBERHARD GOTHEIN. Pp. 331. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1949. Cloth, 13.80 Sw. fr.

THIS edition of the *Consolatio Philosophiae* in the series 'Die Bibliothek der Alten Welt' is

substantially a reprint of an earlier translation by Eberhard Gothein (Berlin, Die Runde, 1932). The main changes are that in place of Peiper's 1871 Teubner text the new edition embodies Weinberger's text in the Vienna Corpus (vol. lxvii. 1934), with emendations by Biehler (*Wien. St. liv.* 1936, 128), Klingner (*Gnomon*, xxvi, 1940, 20), Büchner (*Hermes*, lxxv. 1940, 278), and Dienelt (*Glotta*, xxix, 1942, 98, 129), and that a number of errors and infelicities in the translation pointed out by Weinberger in his review in *Ph.W.* 1933, 414 ff. have been removed. Minor additions have been made to the introduction, written for the original edition by Marie-Luise Gothein.

The reviser, Wolfgang Gothein, has done his work well: but it is surprising to find *Ursa . . . nunquam occiduo lota profundo* (4. metr. 6. 10) translated 'die Bärin, die . . . kommt niemals in die Tiefe des Westens', in spite of Weinberger's warning that *profundum* here means 'the sea', and that *occiduo* is by hypallage for *occidua*. And there is no trace of the augmented 'Namen- und Sachregister' mentioned on p. 313.

Gothein's translation, which was the work of a lifetime (cf. M. L. Gothein, *Eberhard Gothein, ein Lebensbild seinen Briefen nacherzählt*, Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1931, pp. 29, 193-8), was considered by German critics to flow easily and naturally (cf. Weinberger, loc. cit.; Bulst, *Historische Vierteljahrsschrift*, xxviii, 1933, 412-13); it has now gained somewhat in accuracy. The introduction gives a lucid and sympathetic sketch of the historical background. The notes contain the necessary minimum of prosopographical and other information needed by the general reader, for whom this series is designed. He has been well served by the Gothein family; the only complaint he might reasonably make is that the introduction does not tell him nearly enough about the great influence throughout the Middle Ages of Boethius' works in general and of the *Consolatio Philosophiae* in particular.

ROBERT BROWNING

University College, London

J. MAROUZEAU: *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine*. Tome III: *Les articulations de l'énoncé*. Pp. 200. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1949. Paper.

STUDENTS of Latin will welcome the publication by M. Marouzeau of this final volume

in a series of studies of word-order, of which the previous parts were *Les groupes nominaux* (1922) and *Le verbe* (1935). The same scholar had dealt earlier with other parts of the subject in *Place du pronom personnel sujet en latin* (1907) and *La phrase à verbe 'être' en latin* (1910). The new volume contains the detailed study of the position of adverbs, prepositions, particles (copulative, disjunctive, adversative, etc.), and of order in the phrase as a whole, and it is rounded off with a general conclusion drawn from the three parts of the work.

M. Marouzeau's method, as before, has been to investigate what seems to be the natural order in such groups as adverb-verb, adverb-adjective, preposition-noun, showing that such an order arises first for historical and philological reasons and is then standardized by analogy, and to continue by arguing that sometimes various other forces, such as the desire for contrast or assonance or suspense, might change the familiar order.

His general conclusions here are those which have been seen elsewhere in his works, for example in the chapter on word-order in his *Traité de stylistique latine*. He contends that Latin word-order is based on certain normal associations and positions, that, for example, the verb is naturally at the end of the phrase, the adverb precedes the word it modifies, particles come in the second or inferior position, and that changes of emphasis or tone are brought about by changes in this order or by the insertion of alien words into the normal group. Attacking the old, easy doctrine that the beginning and the end of the sentence are invariably kept for words of the greatest weight, he is concerned to establish that in the first position Latin often puts not the most important word but the subject next to be introduced, and that the choice of words for the final position is often governed by desire for rhetorical point.

M. Marouzeau shows that the subject is one of great complexity, involving a simultaneous consideration of various factors: historical syntax, the normal order, all sorts of rhetorical devices, various types of speech—colloquial, archaic, poetic, idiosyncratic—rhythm and prosody, as well as qualities of tone very hard to recapture. It is no surprise that he carries out this manifold study with great acuteness and clarity although his only claim is to have indicated one more subject for investigation.

J. A. H. WAX

University of Glasgow

H. L. PINNER: *The World of Books in Classical Antiquity*. Pp. 64; 12 plates, 2 figures. Leyden: Sijthoff (London: Allen & Unwin), 1948. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

THIS book begins by describing the papyrus roll and the parchment codex, and proceeds to an account of the production, publishing, and selling of books in antiquity, ending with a chapter on 'Ancient Libraries and Bibliophiles'. Passages in classical authors referred to in the text are given in an appendix of Source References. There is much good material here, but the content of the book is marred by faulty scholarship and inaccuracy, and the exposition by defects in arrangement and style.

P.'s worst defects are exposed by his principal merit, his extensive use of ancient sources. The appendix of Source References is incomplete, extremely inaccurate, inexact in its method of referring to the text, and sometimes inconsistent with the text. Classical works are often wrongly designated, and there are several misprints of proper names, both in text and appendix. Nor is the book free from misstatements of fact; on p. 28 we are told that Aeschylus is not represented at all on papyri, and on p. 21 P. seems unable to define a palimpsest. There is also a tendency to make exaggerated deductions from the ancient evidence. These defects are most conspicuous in the chapters on Greece; Rome is treated rather better.

The exposition is vitiated by an inconsequence which borders at times on the ridiculous, as in the paragraph beginning at the bottom of p. 26, and the author often seems unaware of the function of the paragraph in English prose. The book cannot, therefore, be considered an adequate account of its subject, though it is not without merit.

D. MERVYN JONES

Trinity College, Cambridge

DEMETRIOS P. MANTZOURANIS: *Οἱ πρῶτες ἐγκαταστάσεις τῶν Ἑλλήνων στὴ Λέσβο*. Pp. 46; map. Mytilene: D. D. Kaldis, 1949. Paper.

THE author's thesis is that Greek-speaking peoples were first seen in Lesbos c. 1700 B.C., and were settled there, as a ruling class over subject people, from c. 1400, that is to say, some time before the Trojan War; and that this is best shown by a study of place-names, though he thinks that it is also supported by

archaeology and by the evidence of the Boghaz-keui tablets. By 'Greeks in Lesbos' he means a Greek principality which must necessarily have been on the Greek side in the Trojan War, for which indeed he thinks that a Greek base in Lesbos was necessary. The evidence of Homer, therefore, both positive and negative, has to be rejected; the Hittite evidence is accepted without question, for, though there is a reference to Sommer in a footnote, there is no recognition of the doubtful nature of Forrer's arguments. The archaeological evidence, from Miss Lamb's excavations, which Mr. Mantzouranis cites, cannot of course decide a question of this nature. And for the place-names, which are his main concern, he can show that many of them (though not as many as he thinks) are Greek and Aeolic, and that a few are non-Greek; but not at all that the former were brought from the Greek mainland before rather than after the Heroic Age. His notes on these place-names, however, and on their survival to the present day, are the most interesting part of the work, though he shows no special linguistic knowledge.

He occasionally touches on classical times; but the puzzle of Cape Malea (Thuc. iii. 4-6) he is content to leave, without a hint that there is a puzzle.

A. W. GOMME

University of Glasgow

HANS ULRICH INSTINSKY: *Alexander der Grosse am Hellespont*. Pp. 72. Godesberg: Küpper, 1949. Paper, DM. 3.80.

IN this little book Instinsky asks what light Alexander's ritual and other acts at the Hellespont shed upon his state of mind and his consciously formulated intentions at the time of his crossing into Asia. The method of relying, for an answer to this question, chiefly upon the evidence of public and undoubted actions is certainly the only sound one; and Alexander's actions were performed before an audience. It does not seem to have been a very large audience, however; indeed, it seems to have been almost confined to Alexander's personal staff and escort; and therefore, though our accounts are in no way improbable, one would have welcomed an attitude of slightly more reserve, at least in dealing with Diodorus' narrative. This, as Instinsky remarks, differs materially from Arrian's; but both are here treated as equally good foundations on which to base an answer to part of the fundamental *Alexanderfrage*.

Instinsky stresses cogently the unsoundness, or rather inadequacy, of treating all Alexander's acts at this point as mere 'imitation of Achilles', pointing out that, even in what is indubitably inspired by the *Iliad*, there is much that has no specific reference to that hero—the attention paid to Protesilaus, for example—and arguing that Alexander's actions were inspired less by the simple text of the epic than by the significance which classical Greek thought had regularly read into it; as witness Herodotus' treatment of the Trojan War in his Introduction, his description of Xerxes' visit to Ilion, and Agesilaus' anxiety to initiate his invasion of Asia by sacrificing at Aulis. On this basis Instinsky builds a strong case for holding that Alexander envisaged nothing less than the seizure of the whole of Asia—i.e. the Persian *oikoumene*—from the outset of his expedition.

A. R. BURN

University of Glasgow

I. A. RICHMOND and O. G. S. CRAWFORD: *The British Section of the Ravenna Cosmography*. Pp. 50: 10 plates. London: Society of Antiquaries, 1949. Paper, 10s. net.

In this reprint from *Archaeologia* Dr. Richmond and Mr. Crawford, with Professor Ifor Williams as adviser on Old Welsh philology, have done a work of major and permanent importance for the study of Romano-British place-names. For this study the Ravenna List is by far the most copious source (300 names, as against 126 in Ptolemy and 113 in the Antonine Itinerary); but lacking, as it does for the most part, any detailed indications of position, it is also the most exasperating. Add that the whole list shows a high degree of textual corruption (*inter alia*, the Celtic names appear to have been at some stage transcribed from Latin into Greek and back again), and it will be evident that the task of getting sense out of it is one which might well have appalled the stoutest heart.

The method employed is, like all good reasoning, simplicity itself; the skill of the editors is in the application of it. Starting from Richmond's hypothesis, for which convincing evidence is adduced, that the list is derived from a map or road-book, and applying the Johnsonian principle (see p. 2) that most place-names are descriptive of physical features, the authors have made impressive progress. Naturally, not everyone

will agree with all the detailed conclusions; for example, after a list of Kentish names ending with Durobrabis (*sic*; for Durobrivis, i.e. Rochester), the next name, *Landini*, followed by *Tamese*, is surely London, as in *It. Ant.* iii and iv, the form *Landini* being merely a minor corruption, unrecognized by 'Ravennas', who gives the correct form later. Many very interesting suggestions are indeed here only put forward tentatively—among others, some attractive identifications of names of Antonine Wall forts. But above all, as a result of the work of this powerful 'team'—combining detailed topographical and archaeological knowledge with Greek, Latin, and Celtic scholarship—the study of Romano-British place-names, which might have seemed almost to have reached its limits, is again on the move. As the authors point out, much remains to be done, both from the side of etymology and from that of detailed field-work. In the mean time, this is a book which should be on the shelves of every local library, and in the hands of every serious student of Roman Britain. The study may seem specialized, even esoteric; but the problems of inference or 'elimination-play' posed might alone be the envy of a puzzle-editor; and as regards results, it does surely add something to one's sense of intimacy with the life of our predecessors when one knows what they themselves called the forts and villages where they lived and served.

The price of the book is, for these days, most moderate, especially since it contains ten excellent and clearly legible photographic plates, showing the manuscript texts of the British portions of 'Ravennas' and the Peutinger Table.

A. R. BURN

University of Glasgow

A. R. BELLINGER: *Excavations at Dura-Europos*. Final Report vi, i: *The Coins*. Pp. ix+214; 42 plates, map. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1949. Cloth, 27s. 6d. net.

THE purely numismatic questions suggested by the coins found in the Dura excavations have been discussed by A. R. Bellinger in monographs of the American Numismatic Society, and he has summarized in this Final Report the historical and economic evidence which they furnish. The material is plentiful, and in some respects unusually informative

for historians, especially in its dating: the destruction of the city by the Parthians on its final capture provides a clear picture, both from hoards and scattered finds, of the local currency of the period, and incidentally throws light on the financial arrangements of the Roman troops. This material has been well used by Bellinger, and there is little to criticize in his treatment: it is possible that he has not given enough latitude for his chronology, in the Seleucid period, to the persistence in circulation of old coins, which is very noticeable in the Near East; but this would affect commercial currency more than military, and the latter may have been more important at Dura under the kings, as it certainly was in Roman times. The evidence provided here might well serve as a standard for comparison with similar records from neighbouring districts, of which some exist,

though much less extensive or definite: for instance, it looks at first sight as if Dura had had little connexion with Phoenicia or Palestine. Another interesting problem on which new light may be thrown here is that of the finds of Peloponnesian local coins struck under the Severan house, to the occurrence of which in Syria Seyrig had previously called attention: they were certainly due to the presence in the province of the 'Pitanate' troops raised by Caracalla, and were assumed to have been brought by the soldiers from home as keepsakes or talismans, an explanation suggested by similar finds in other parts of the Roman Empire, from Britain to Egypt; but the large number—nearly a hundred—from Dura seems to require a modification of this theory.

J. G. MILNE

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

XLVI. 1: JANUARY 1951

C. Edson, *The Location of Cellae and the Route of the Via Egnatia in Western Macedonia*. W. C. Helmbold, *The Song of the Argive Woman's Daughter*: analyses Theocr. 15. 100-44 and proposes the transposition of 127 to follow 111 and (perhaps) of 128 to follow 130. R. J. Getty, *East and West in Lucan 1. 15 and elsewhere*: shows, with quotation of parallels, that *nox sidera condit* means 'night hides the setting sun'. A. C. Schlesinger, *Three Actors and Poetry*: Aristotle does not support the theory of a limited number of actors and Aeschylus' two were a minimum, not a maximum. V. B. Schuman, *Again Three Accounting Terms of Roman Egypt*: defends his views stated in C.P. xlv. 4 against D. S. Crawford's criticisms in C.P. xlv. 3. K. Gries quotes examples of subconscious repetition in Livy.

DIONISO

XIII (N.S.), Fasc. 3: JULY 1950

A. Olivieri, *Dionisio I tiranno di Siracusa e Patrocle di Turi, poeti drammatici*: the text of the fragments with translation and notes.

G. Caputo, *Curia, castellieri e terminologia della cavea greca a pianta centrale*: a note on the plan of theatres and places of assembly in relation to their function. V. Fossati, *Il mito nelle tragedie di Crizia*: Critias' treatment of myth exemplifies his sophistic doctrine. S. d'Amico, *L'Istituto Nazionale del Dramma Antico nel suo venticinquesimo anno*: the text of an address to the Institute at Syracuse, 7 May 1950. *L'undicesimo ciclo di spettacoli classici a Siracusa nel giudizio della stampa*: press notices of the Institute's production of the *Persae* and the *Bacchae* in the Greek theatre at Syracuse, 6-12 May.

HERMATHENA

LXXV: MAY 1950

R. M. Henry, *Pietas and Fides in Catullus* (concluded in *Hermath.* lxxvi): interprets Catull. lxxvi; *pietas* is a quality shown in a man's relations with his fellows, not with the gods; *fides*, a cardinal part of *pietas*, means a sense of honour and obligation. F. R. M. Hitchcock, *The Trials of St. Paul and Apollonius*: points out parallels in detail between Philostratus' *Life of A.* and the Pastoral Epistles. W. B. Stanford, *Studies in the Characterization of Ulysses—III*: appraises Odysseus' reputa-

tion as a liar: in the *Iliad* O. is scrupulously truthful except to Dolon (x. 383); in the *Odyssey* he is forced by circumstances into deceitfulness but never tells an unforgivable, malevolent lie; his reputation for cunning probably derives from pre-Homeric folklore. J. C. Miles, *The Attic Law of Intestate Succession*: discusses the implications of Dem. *Contra Macart.* 51, and proposes τοῦ πατρὸς ἀδελφῶν καὶ παίδας to fill the lacuna.

LXXVI: NOVEMBER 1950

R. M. Henry, *Pietas and Fides in Catullus* (concluded): see above. E. A. Thompson, *The Foreign Policies of Theodosius II and Marcian*: reverses the usual estimate of their merits, which is due primarily to the bias of Priscus in favour of Marcian.

MNEMOSYNE

4th Series III, (1950), Fasc. iv.

H. J. Rose, *Myth and Ritual in Classical Civilisation*: concludes that in the Greek world myth and ritual are not, as in many lower cultures, so closely related as to form parts of a single pattern; among the aspects considered are the Eleusinian mysteries, the origins of tragedy, Plut. *Thes.* 23, Plato *Tim.* 26 e, and two passages of Callimachus. L. Byvanck-Quarles van Ufford, *La Chronologie de l'Art grec* (iv): the development of Greek vase-painting during the period 475-425 B.C. may be summed up: (1) 475-460, growing interest in the human figure and in drapery; (2) about 460, archaizing tendency; (3) 450-435, when vase-painting has many parallels with the Parthenon sculptures, striving after simplicity, space, and atmosphere; (4) 435-430, zenith of classical style; (5) from 430 onwards, over-elegance and exaggeration typical of the beginning of decadence. G. J. D. Aalders, *The Political Faith of Democritus*: attempts to reconcile apparent contradictions in fragments of Democritus giving a guide to his political beliefs, shows him as an individualist who condemned the extremes of both democracy and oligarchy, and defines his attitude towards the laws. L. M. de Rijk, *Some Notes on Arist., Metaph.* A 4.985^b9: here and in *Meteor.* ii. 356^a6 the phrase οὐδὲν μᾶλλον ἢ can be explained in the same way as the not uncommon usage of *non magis quam, non minus quam, tam . . . quam, etc.*, in which the stress lies on the first term rather than, as usually, on the second. J. Korven, *Néron et Musonius*: gives an outline of the life of C. Musonius Rufus, discusses whether he took

part in Nero's scheme to dig a Corinth canal, and examines the evidence about Musonius' attitude towards Nero from Ps.-Lucian, *Nero*, and passages from Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius*. Michiel van den Hout, *Reminiscences of Fronto in Marcus Aurelius' Book of Meditations*: in spite of the difference of outlook between Fronto and Marcus Aurelius, there are reminiscences of language and thought connecting the two, especially in the search for choice words. A. G. Roos, *Lusius Quietus, A Reply*, and W. den Boer, *Lusius Quietus, Last Words*: the discussion concluded, Den Boer also criticizing A. Iordănescu, *Lusius Quietus* (Bucharest, 1941).

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM FÜR
PHILOLOGIE

LXXXXIII. 4 (1950)

E. Bickel, *Syllabus indiciorum quibus pseudo-vergiliana et pseudo-ovidiana carmina definiuntur*: *Ciris* is to be dated c. 18 B.C., *Culex* in the last years of Augustus, *Aetna* in the closing years of Tiberius or under Claudius. L. Radermacher, *Die Mädchen aus dem Hyperboreerland*: the fact that Opis occurs as a man's name suggests that the Hyperborean maidens of Hdt. iv. 35 (cf. 32) represent one original bisexual deity of the kind worshipped in the Stone Age. K. Hubert, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung für Plutarchs Moralia 70-7*: rejects Manton's arguments (*C.Q.* xliii. 97-104) that B is derived from E, and maintains that B represents a tradition related to, but independent of, E. E. Wüst, *Epicharmus und die alte attische Komödie*: The plays of Epicharmus were certainly known in Athens, but the development of Old Attic Comedy was independent of them. W. Kraus, *Das Wesen des Unendlichen bei Anaximander*: τὸ ἀπειρον is not material, but the source of all Being, which springs from it by a metaphysical, rather than a physical, process. A. von Gerkan, *Die Belagerungsmauer von Plataiai*: Thuc. iii. 21 describes not two walls but one with defences facing front and rear. S. Gutenbrunner, *Eine nordeuropäische Stammesnecker bei Homer?* *Od.* xi. 121 ff.: points to a word-play on a root meaning 'oar' in one language, 'shovel' in another. Such a root is found in Ir. *lu*, Cym. *llyw* 'rudder', Alban. *l'opate* 'oar', O. Slav. *lopata*, Lith. *lopeta* 'shovel', O. Pruss. *lopto* 'spade'. The jest arose among the Illyrians in their early home on the Baltic at the expense of the Slavs who had no interest in the sea. From the Illyrians in their historical home it passed to the Greeks, and with *Od.* x. 83 ff. pre-

serves traces of an early knowledge of north Europe. L. Wickert, *Zur Frage der Echtheit des dritten platonischen Briefes*: the intimate but unobtrusive knowledge of Plato's views at the time proves the authenticity of the letter. E. Bickel, *era verecunda Catull. 68. 136: verecundae* should stand; Catullus attributes to Clodia the quality which he expects his spiritual love to produce in her.

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA

N.S. XXVIII (1950): 2

C. Gallavotti, *Studi sulla lirica greca* (continued from *Riv. Fil.* 1944-5): 8. *Revisione metrica di frammenti eolici*: defines the main characteristics of Aeolic metres and applies the definitions to the emendation of certain fragments; 9. *La responsione esterna nella metrica eolica*: discusses certain cases in which Aeolic poems depart from the rule of 'isostrofia' and offers certain supplements; 10. *Figura e misura delle strofe eoliche*: uses the characteristic 'brachistrofia' of Aeolic verse as a support for certain proposed emendations of Sappho. T. Bolelli, *Cāritas. Storia di una parola*: elaborate etymological study of *caritas*, its cognates and derivatives, with due regard for the cultural, religious, and philosophical conditions which have given rise to the various senses. M. Guarducci, *Note sul*

koinon cretese: 1. La fondazione del *koinon*: discusses various possible dates for the foundation of the *koinon*, and decides that the conventional date 217/216 is the most probable; 2. Il *koinodikion*: discusses the uses of the word *κοινοδικιον* in Cretan inscriptions and in a passage of Polybius (22.15.1), and concludes that whereas in Crete *koinodikion* means 'tribunale del *koinon*', elsewhere in Greece it meant 'tribunale misto'. Reviews. Notes and comments. Publications received.

N.S. XXVIII (1950): 3

E. v. Ivanka, *Saeculum—Semina di anime*: considers briefly the importance of the concept of *saeculum* in connexion with *ludi saeculares*, and the child of the fourth Eclogue. L. Alfonsi, *Talete e l'Egizio*: discusses the tale of Thales and the Egyptian in Tertullian, *ad Nat.* 2. 4, with reference to other tales about Greeks and Egyptians from the *Timaeus* onwards. G. Piccoli, *Gr. θεός, Lat. deus, Recherche etimologiche*: detailed analysis of the etymologies of *θεός* and *deus*, concluding that *θεός* = *spiritus (dei)* and *deus* = *ens splendens* (in the Biblical sense); the origins of the two words are different. E. Manni, *L'Egitto tolemaico nei suoi rapporti politici con Roma*: 11. *L'instaurazione del protettorato romano*: discusses Roman relations with Egypt from 173 B.C. to the establishment by A. Gabinius of a Roman garrison in Alexandria.

NOTES AND NEWS

In our Books Received columns we note the appearance of Volume I (A-L) of the revised edition of Ernout and Meillet's *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Latine*, which is being published in two volumes. Volume I is now being issued to subscribers only, but after the appearance of Volume II, which is to be expected in June, the work will be sold to non-subscribers: it is hoped to issue it in one bound volume for the British market.

In *Die Wiederbelebung der Internationalen Papyrologie*, which appears as Heft 39 of the *Vorträge und Schriften* of the Berlin Academy (Akademie-Verlag, DM. 1.50) Dr. E. J. Knudtzon of Lund gives an account of papyrological studies in Scandinavia and of the proceedings of the Papyrological Congress held in Paris in 1949. He suggests that future congresses organized by the International Association of Papyrology should be directed to presenting a survey of work in progress and a comparison of results rather than detailed and unconnected studies and makes a plea for the removal of financial barriers to international co-operation.

The new Spanish journal *Estudios Clásicos*, which is to appear three times a year as an offshoot of the *Revista de la Sociedad Española de Pedagogía*, is professedly concerned not so much with original investigation as with scholarly popularization; its aim is to help Spanish classical teachers to keep abreast of current academic work in their subject. The first number was issued in December and sets a high standard: there are articles on recent developments in the textual criticism of the New Testament and the Septuagint, on verbal aspects and on the use of translation in Latin teaching, and bibliographies on the minor works of Tacitus and on the origins of Greek tragedy.

We have received from Mlle I. Plaut, St. Pience, Manche, a series of five film-strips illustrating Greek life from vase-paintings and intended for use in schools. The subjects are (1) wedding ceremonies, (2) funeral ceremonies, (3) and (4) country life, and (5) sports. Short commentaries in English are provided. They may be ordered from Mlle Plaut: payment (10s. for each strip) may be made to the British and French Bank, 33-6 King William Street, London, E.C. 4.

The General Meeting of the Classical Association was held from 3 to 7 April in Liverpool. The Hon. Harold Nicolson delivered his Presidential Address on Nature in Greek Literature, and a very well-balanced programme of lectures was provided—Problems of Greek Nationality (F. W. Walbank), Thucydides and the Literary Speech (H. Ll. Hudson-Williams), Poetry and Textual Criticism in the *Odes* (A. Y. Campbell), The Humanism of Cicero (H. A. Kinross Hunt), The Teaching Profession in Rome (S. F. Bonner), Onesicritus' Story of Alexander (L. I. C. Pearson), Life and Literature in Oxyrhynchus (E. G. Turner), Plato and Dion (W. H. Porter), Terence (F. W. Clayton). 'Communications' produced a varied and interesting set of short papers. There were archaeological visits to Chester (under the guidance of Mr. Graham Webster) and to the collections at Ince Blundell Hall (under that of Mr. R. W. Hutchinson). University and City vied in offering entertainment to the visitors; they were given a performance of Anouilh's *Antigone* by members of the University, and were conducted over the Cathedral and (by kindness of the Cunard Company) over the *Britannic* in dock. The arrangements were a model of quiet efficiency, and Mr. Bonner and the other members of the Liverpool Branch who were responsible for them earned the congratulations and the thanks of all their guests.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included unless they are also published separately.

- Bengtson (H.)** Griechische Geschichte von den Anfängen bis in die römische Kaiserzeit. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, iii. 4.) Pp. xvi+591; 12 maps. Munich: Beck, 1950. Cloth, DM. 46 (Paper, DM. 40).
- Björck (G.)** Das Alpha impurum und die tragische Kunstsprache. Attische Wort- und Stilstudien. (Skrifter utgivna av K. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Uppsala, 39: 1.) Pp. 392. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1951. Paper, 30 kr.
- Bonner (S. F.)** Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire. Pp. viii+189. Liverpool: University Press, 1949. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Braga (D.)** Catullo e i Poeti greci. Pp. 274. Messina: D'Anna, 1950. Paper, L. 1200.
- Bury (J. B.)** History of Greece. Third edition revised by R. Meiggs. Pp. xxv+925; 209 figs., 8 maps and plans. London: Macmillan, 1951. Cloth, 16s. net.
- Callaway (J. S.)** Sybaris. (Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 37.) Pp. ix+131. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1950. Cloth, 40s. set.
- Carcopino (J.)** Cicero: The Secrets of his Correspondence. Translated by E. O. Lorimer. In 2 vols. Pp. vii+596. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1951. Cloth, 42s. net.
- Chase (A. H.) and Phillips (H.)** A New Introduction to Greek. Revised edition. Pp. x+186; 8 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1949. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Constans (L. A.), Bayet (J.)** Cicéron: Correspondance. Tome IV. Pp. 260. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1951. Paper.
- Courcelle (P.)** Recherches sur les Confessions de Saint Augustin. Pp. 299. Paris: de Boccard, 1950. Paper, 850 fr.
- Dumbarton Oaks Papers.** Number V. Pp. ix+279; 76 ill. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1950. Cloth, 48s. net.
- Ehrenberg (V.)** The People of Aristophanes. A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy. Second edition. Pp. xx+418; 19 plates. Oxford: Blackwell, 1951. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Emerita.** Tomo XVII. Pp. 450. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1949. Paper.
- Erbse (H.)** Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika. (Abh. der deutschen Akad. der Wiss. zu Berlin, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1949, Nr. 2.) Pp. 256. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1950. Paper, DM. 37.
- Ernout (A.) and Meillet (A.)** Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Latine. Troisième édition revue, corrigée et augmentée d'un index. Tome I (A-L). Pp. xxv+667. Paper.
- Hansson (N.)** Textkritisches zu Juvenac. Mit vollständigem Index Verborum. Pp. 169. Lund: Gleerup, 1950. Paper, 10 kr.
- Hartke (W.)** Römische Kinderkaiser. Eine Strukturanalyse römischen Denkens und Daseins. Pp. xi+487. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1951. Paper, DM. 49.
- Henry (P.) and Schwyzer (H. R.)** Plotini Opera. Tomus I: Porphyrii Vita Plotini, Enneades i-iii. Pp. lviii+420. Brussels: Desclée, De Brouwer et Cie, 1951. Cloth.
- Herbig (R.)** and others. Vermächtnis der antiken Kunst. Gastvorträge zur Jahrhundertfeier der Archäologischen Sammlungen der Universität Heidelberg. Herausgegeben von R. H. Pp. 232; 78 ill. on plates. Heidelberg: Kerle, 1950. Cloth, DM. 12.
- Hoffmann (E.)** Griechische Philosophie bis Platon. Pp. 184. Heidelberg: Kerle, 1951. Cloth, DM. 7.50.
- Jashemski (W. F.)** The Origins and History of the Proconsular and the Proprætorian Imperium to 27 B.C. Pp. ix+174. Chicago: University Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1951. Paper, 37s. 6d. net.
- Josephson (Å.)** Casae Litterarum. Studien zum Corpus Agrimensorum Romanorum. Pp. xx+316. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1950. Paper.
- Casae Litterarum. Opuscula ex Corpore agrimensorum Romanorum selecta recensuit et germanice vertit Å. J. Pp. 27. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1951. Paper.
- Kahrstedt (U.)** Artabanos III und seine Erben. (Dissertationes Bernenses, Ser. I, Fasc. 2.) Pp. 89; 2 maps. Bern: Francke, 1950. Paper, 9.50 Sw.fr.
- Katz (J.)** Plotinus' Search for the Good. Pp. xi+106. New York: King's Crown Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1951. Cloth, 16s. net.
- Kenyon (F. G.)** Books and Readers in Greece

- and Rome. Second edition. Pp. viii+136; 7 plates, 2 figs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Knowles* (D.) *The Monastic Constitutions of Lanfranc*. (Nelson's Medieval Classics.) Pp. xl+157. Edinburgh: Nelson, 1951. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Kraiker* (W.) *Das Kentaurenbild des Zeuxis*. (Winckelmannsprogramm der Archäol. Gesellschaft zu Berlin, 106.) Pp. 31; 5 figs. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1950. Paper, DM. 9.
- Lahby* (D.) *Manuel des Particules Grecques*. Pp. 86. Paris: Klincksieck, 1950. Paper.
- Lands* (C.), *Castiglioni* (L.) *P. Ovidi Nasonis Factorum libri VI. Recensuit C. L., editionem paravit alteram L. C. (Corpus Scr. Lat. Paravianum.)* Pp. lxii+240. Turin: Paravia, 1950. Paper, L. 1200.
- Laroche* (E.) *Histoire de la Racine NEM- en Grec ancien. (Études et Commentaires, VI.)* Pp. 275. Paris: Klincksieck, 1949 (1950). Paper, 960 fr.
- Laurey* (M.) *Recherches sur les Armées hellénistiques. Seconde partie: Recherches sociologiques.* (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 169.) Pp. 633-1317. Paris: de Boccard, 1950.
- Legrand* (P. E.) *Hérodote: Histoires, Livre VII. Texte établi et traduit.* (Collection Budé.) Pp. 235. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1951. Paper.
- Levin* (S.) *Aelius Aristides: To Rome. Translated with notes and introduction.* Pp. 31. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1950. Paper, \$1.
- Loewe* (E. A.) *Codices Latini Antiquiores. Part V: France—Paris.* Pp. viii+63; plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951. Cloth and boards, £5 net.
- Maas* (P.) *Textkritik. 2. verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage.* Pp. 31. Leipzig: Teubner, 1950. Paper, \$0.55.
- Macneise* (L.) *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus translated.* Pp. 71. London: Faber, 1951. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Magie* (D.) *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the end of the third century after Christ. Vol. I: Text.* Pp. xxi+724. Vol. II: Notes. Pp. 725-1661; map. Princeton: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1950. Cloth, 130s. net.
- Manni* (E.) *L'Impero di Gallieno. Contributo alla storia del III secolo.* Pp. 117. Rome: Signorelli, 1949. Paper, L. 300.
- Marra* (J.) *Q. Septimii Tertulliani De Corona liber, De Cultu Feminarum libri duo. (Corpus Scr. Lat. Paravianum.)* Pp. 182. Turin: Paravia, 1950. Paper, L. 600.
- Metzger* (B. M.) *Index of Articles on the New Testament and the Early Church published in Festschriften.* (Journal of Biblical Literature, Monograph Series, Vol. V.) Pp. xv+182. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1951. Paper.
- Mondolfo* (R.) *Il Pensiero Antico. Storia della filosofia greco-romana.* Pp. 644. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1950. Paper, L. 3000.
- Paton* (J. M.) *Mediaeval and Renaissance Visitors to Greek Lands.* (Gennadeion Monographs, III.) Pp. xii+212. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1951. Cloth and boards.
- Perret* (J.) *Recherches sur le texte de la 'Germanie'.* (Collection d'Études Latines, XXV.) Pp. 166. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1950. Paper.
- Pohlentz* (M.) *Gestalten aus Hellas.* Pp. 744; 16 plates. Munich: Bruckmann, 1950. Cloth, DM. 25.
- Pringsheim* (F.) *The Greek Law of Sale.* Pp. xix+580. Weimar: Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger, 1950. Paper.
- Reinach* (J.) *Gaius: Institutes. Texte établi et traduit.* (Collection Budé.) Pp. xix+194. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1951. Paper.
- Roberts* (C. H.) *The Antinoopolis Papyri. Part I. Edited with translations and notes.* Pp. xii+119; 2 plates. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1951. Cloth and boards, 25s. net.
- Schachermeyr* (F.) *Poseidon und die Entstehung des griechischen Götterglaubens.* Pp. 221. Bern: Francke, 1950. Paper, 13.80 Sw. fr.
- Scharff* (A.), *Moortgat* (A.) *Ägypten und Vorderasien im Altertum.* Pp. 535. Munich: Bruckmann, 1951. Cloth, DM. 18.
- Scheltema* (H. J.) *Florilegium Iurisprudentiae Graeco-Romanae. (Iustus Minores, No. XIII.)* Pp. 61. Leiden: Brill, 1950. Paper, 2 g.
- Scullard* (H. H.) *Roman Politics, 220-150 B.C.* Pp. xvi+325; front. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Stecchini* (L. C.) *The Constitution of the Athenians by the Old Oligarch and by Aristotle. A new interpretation.* Pp. 112. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1950. Cloth, \$2.50.
- Stein* (A.) *Die Präfecten von Ägypten in römischer Zeit. (Dissertationes Bernenses, Ser. I, Fasc. 1.)* Pp. 248. Bern: Francke, 1950. Paper, 16 Sw. fr.
- Stob* (R.) *Christianity and Classical Civilization.* Pp. 198. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1950. Cloth, \$3.

- Strömberg* (R.) The Aeolus Episode and Greek Wind Magic. (From *Symbolae Philologicae Gotoborgenses.*) Pp. 16. Gothenburg: Elander, 1950. Paper.
- Trevelyan* (R. C.) Translations from Greek Poetry. Pp. 73. London: Allen & Unwin, 1951. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Vollenhoven* (D. H. T.) Geschiedenis der Wijsbegeerte. Band I: Inleiding en Geschiedenis der Grieksche Wijsbegeerte voor Platoon en Aristoteles. Pp. 618. Franeker: Wever, 1950. Cloth, 25 g.
- Walser* (G.) Rom, das Reich und die fremden Völker in der Geschichtsschreibung der frühen Kaiserzeit. Studien zur Glaubwürdigkeit des Tacitus. Pp. 183. Baden-Baden: Verlag für Kunst und Wissenschaft, 1951. Paper.
- Zucker* (F.) Plotin und Lykopolis. (Sitz. der deutschen Ak. der Wiss. zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur u. Kunst, 1950, Nr. 1.) Pp. 20. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1950. Paper, DM. 1.50.

und die frem-
tschreibung
Studien zur
us. Pp. 189.
Kunst und

lis. (Sitz. der
Berlin, Klasse
Kunst, 1930.
ernie-Verlag,